DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 016 CG 009 823

AUTHOR	Glenn, William A.; Richards, Louise G.
TITLE	Recent Surveys of Nonmedical Drug Use: A Compendium of Abstracts.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. on Drug Abuse (DHEW/PHS), Rockville, Md.; Research Triangle Inst., Durham, N.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-ADM-75-139
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	161p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Abstracts; *Drug Abuse; Literature Reviews; Research Methodology; *Statistical Data; *Surveys; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Because of the dramatic increases in nonmedical drug use in the 1960's, hundreds of surveys have been conducted to gain perspective on its extent and nature. This compendium is a compilation of quantitative information abstracted from studies on drug use, published since 1971. It examines methodological questions essential for interpreting and using the findings, and it summarizes major patterns and trends revealed by the surveys. The surveys found on the extent of nonmedical drug use fell into four general categories: (1) nationwide surveys; (2) surveys of high school populations; (3) surveys of college and university populations; and (4) surveys of other kinds of populations. The compendium offers a summary and interpretation of the overall findings as indicated by comparisons by geographic region, by age and grade in school, by sex, by sociodemographic characteristics, and over time. (Author/PC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED108016

Recent Surveys of Nonmedical Drug Use: a compendium of abstracts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG009823

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

ED108016

Recent Surveys of Nonmedical Drug Use: a compendium of abstracts

William A. Glenn, Ph.D.
Research Triangle Institute
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina

and

Louise G. Richards, Ph.D.
National Institute on Drug Abuse
Rockville, Maryland

JULY 1974

National Institute on Drug Abuse
11400 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

The original report upon which this publication is based was prepared for the National Institute on Drug Abuse by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709, under Contract No. HSM-42-72-169.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Developing the Compendium 1

A Preview of Survey Terminology 2

Summary and Interpretation of Findings 3

- Comparisons by Geographic Region 4
- Comparisons by Age and Grade in School 4
- Comparisons by Sex 8
- Comparisons by Sociodemographic Characteristics 8
- Comparisons over Time 9

Comments on Survey Methods 12

- Sampling 12
- Sample Size 13
- Nonresponse Bias 13
- Response Validity 13
- Questionnaire Preparation and Administration 15
- Methodological Requirements 15

Cited References 16

Appendix A - Abstracts - Nationwide Surveys 17

Appendix B - Abstracts - Surveys of High School Populations 25

Appendix C - Abstracts - Surveys of University Populations 57

Appendix D - Abstracts - Surveys of Other Populations 67

Appendix E - Master List 81

Appendix F - Author Index 95

Appendix G - Index of Reports Containing Statistical Information on Characteristics Other Than Extent of Drug Abuse 99

INTRODUCTION

Because of the dramatic increases in nonmedical drug use in the 1960's, literally hundreds of surveys have been conducted to gain perspective on its extent and nature. The results of these surveys have been of considerable interest to policymakers, researchers, and the public. Some of the survey results have been published in professional journals. Others have been released independently as technical reports. Still others, not published at all, have been circulated only in groups of interested persons. This compendium brings together statistics from recent surveys of groups and the general population.

A number of surveys have been conducted in limited populations, mainly in schools and colleges. In 1971, the first nationwide survey of the general population was conducted for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse; a second one was conducted in late 1972. (Before 1971, several nationwide surveys were conducted by polling organizations, but information available from them is scanty; see Berg and Broecker 1972.) Thus, the base of information from surveys is now considerably expanded over that of the earlier compilations (Berg 1970; Berg and Broecker 1972). Efforts to measure the extent and nature of nonmedical drug use nationwide are being continued by the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Although the earlier compilations depended primarily on surveys of limited populations (e.g., students in schools and colleges), they were valuable then as the only data sources for portrayal of the national picture. Limited surveys continue to be of interest since they focus on special patterns of nonmedical drug use not ascertainable in nationwide sample surveys.

To the extent that this is a compilation of quantitative information abstracted from recent studies, it is a continuation of the earlier work (Berg 1970; Berg and Broecker 1972). However, this compendium also examines methodological questions essential for interpreting and using the findings, and it summarizes major patterns and trends revealed by the surveys.

DEVELOPING THE COMPENDIUM

The first step in developing the compendium was the collection from all available sources of any published or unpublished reports of recent studies that contain statistics on the extent of nonmedical drug use. The surveys found were of four general types:

1. Nationwide surveys,
2. Surveys of high school populations,
3. Surveys of college and university populations, and
4. Surveys of other kinds of populations.

"Recent" was defined as having been published or becoming available in 1971 or later. Because of the time lag between manuscript preparation and appearance of published articles, some of the surveys reported were actually conducted before 1971.

The second step was the extraction and compilation of statistics on the extent of use from each report collected. For each report to be included in the compendium, statistics were compiled in a standard format as an abstract. The abstract was labeled with an item number to facilitate text referencing, and a full bibliographic reference was given for identifying the original report.

Each abstract highlights the quantitative information in the report and describes as concisely as possible the context (the purpose, setting, and methods of the survey). The population surveyed, the geographic region and community (type and size) and the data collection technique are described if the information was available or could be inferred. Either the number of respondents or the sample size are given. In many cases a sample, in the statistical sense, was not involved. (This point is discussed more fully in the methodology section below.)

Abstracts are grouped by the four types of surveys in appendices A, B, C, and D. Also included are appendices E and F--a master list of the bibliographic citations for the 98 abstracted reports and an index of individual authors with the item numbers of their papers or reports. Since most surveys on nonmedical drug use have information on the use of other kinds of substances and on social and demographic characteristics of respondents, an index of other measured variables is included as appendix G.

As a commentary on the populations of interest, the surveys of high school populations make up the largest subset of abstracted items. Apparently the interest in assessing the extent of drug abuse has centered on students in the junior and senior high schools. Next in order have been various student populations in colleges and universities. Less has been done in surveying the extent of drug abuse among populations other than those. Because of the imbalance among types of surveys, some high school and college surveys were omitted, but all of the eligible nationwide surveys and those of non-student populations were included.

A PREVIEW OF SURVEY TERMINOLOGY

"Percentage of respondents," a phrase used almost uniformly throughout the abstracts, should be interpreted literally. It means the percentage of those who responded to the questionnaire or other survey instrument. There were a few cases in which the abstracter performed a minor amount of calculation in order to present the data as percentages of respondents. When this was done, it was indicated on the abstract that the cited data "... have been inferred." "Notes" on each abstract contain information needed to place the quantitative information in the context of the survey.

The degree to which percentages of respondents in the surveys reported reflect unbiased and precise estimates of the corresponding percentages in the target population is generally not known. The degree depends on the extent to which the sample or the set of respondents truly represents the target population. (Aspects of this problem are dealt with in the section

on methodology.) Strictly literal interpretations limit the quantitative conclusions which can be drawn. However, these conclusions are based on the best and latest available information on the extent of drug abuse in the United States.

The precise terminology used by the authors of the reports, but not necessarily the order of presentation, is retained in the abstracts. Generally, the order is as follows:

Marihuana and hashish
Hallucinogens, psychedelics, etc.
Amphetamines, stimulants, etc.
Barbiturates, depressants, etc.
Opiates, narcotics
Inhalants, etc.

Authors often defined generic terms to indicate what they included, but those definitions varied slightly from one report to another; for example, sometimes "hallucinogens" included LSD, sometimes not. Other authors did not clearly indicate what a given term was intended to include. Occasionally the same drugs were found classified or grouped in different ways. The abstracted studies covered about 60 different drug names.

The measure that the authors used most frequently in the abstracted surveys was "ever used." Regrettably, it is the least meaningful measure because it embraces the entire spectrum of users--from those who tried a drug only once to those who use the drug several times a day. The ways in which the time element was introduced also varied widely. Some examples are: "during the past year," "in the current school year," "within the previous 6 months," "during the last 3 months," and "in the past 7 days."

In addition to the above inconsistencies, terms were used differently in different studies: the term regular use was defined in one study as "daily use"; in another, as "more than once a week," in still others as "twice a month to twice a week" or "at least six times a month." Other terms either defined explicitly or left to the subjective judgment of the respondent were "frequent," "occasional," "often," "extreme," "casual," "heavy," and "habitual."

Although the phenomenon of nonmedical drug use does not fit the disease model in all respects, this area of research is often referred to as epidemiology. It is surprising, therefore, that the traditional concepts of prevalence and incidence have not been used very often.

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

The surveys abstracted dealt with a wide range of nonmedical drugs and employed a considerable variety of measures of the extent of use. The surveys were conducted in a variety of different ways on different populations in widely separated parts of the country in different years, and the statistics were subject to biases and unknown amounts of random error.

Thus, for a number of reasons, the results from individual surveys cannot easily be combined. Nevertheless, tentative conclusions can be drawn about the extent and nature of use. Since differences have not been tested for significance, all conclusions are based on visual inspection of the order and magnitude of differences.

Comparisons within a single survey are more likely to be reliable than those between different surveys because some of the extraneous factors tend to be constant within a survey. The strongest conclusions are based on comparisons within individual surveys. Less credible are those conclusions supported by the results of two or more independent surveys.

Comparisons by Geographic Region

The data from five of eight nationwide surveys made possible comparisons by geographic regions classified as West, Northeast, North Central, and South. Those data are in table 1. For marijuana in 1971 and 1972, the percentages for adult and youth respondents who "ever used" were generally highest in the West and lowest in the South. However, both 1971 and 1972 percentages for adults and youth in the Northeast and North Central did not appear to be significantly different. For LSD use by adults and youth in 1972, the figures appeared in decreasing order for the West, North Central, Northeast, and South but were almost equal for the Northeast and South. For cocaine use by adults in 1972, the decreasing order was the same as that for LSD, but data for youth indicated little if any difference by region. The percentages for heroin use in 1972 and 1971 were so small, for both adults and youth, that the regional differences could not be taken seriously; in fact, the sampling error was as large or larger than any differences.

Drug use data by region were available from the survey conducted in selected high schools (item 28). The weighted averages (computed ad hoc by the present authors) in table 2 cannot be offered as truly representative data for the regions since the schools were selected purposively, not sampled randomly. Among the senior high schools were eight possible comparisons. The percentages were highest for the West Coast schools in five comparisons; the East Coast in two; and the Midwest in one. Among the junior high schools, the West Coast percentages were higher than those of the East Coast schools in all comparisons.

There was no basis for concluding from these comparisons that regional differences may be diminishing, as some have speculated. Nationwide data to be reported later in 1974 will provide up-to-date estimates of recent changes in regional patterns.

Comparisons by Age and Grade in School

Comparisons of use by age, within given surveys, showed a fairly consistent pattern: the percentages for those who ever used drugs were higher in later adolescence and young adulthood. The percentages increased with

fairly regular increments from age 12 to that period and then decreased to very small percentages after age 50. There was one major exception (volatile substances) and many minor fluctuations, but the general pattern was plain.

Broader influences on age differences from single-time surveys must be made cautiously. When the use dimension under consideration is "ever used," it would be logical to expect that, with all other conditions remaining the same, higher use rates would occur at successively older ages (i.e., cumulative percentages for each individual's use). Social and historical forces change this logical expectation, however. Even though all age groups were exposed to the same phenomenon in recent years, older age groups were not exposed at the same age as modern adolescents have been. The observed age differences in percentage who ever used undoubtedly reflect real differences in predisposition or vulnerability. It will be of interest to observe the peak of "ever used" percentages in the future to see whether it remains the same.

The nationwide differences in use by age groups are shown in items 1, 2, and 3. Where figures were available on the entire age range (from 12 to 50 and older), the peak of the percentages was in the 18-21 or 18-25 ages; the next most prominent peak was in the 16-17's for cocaine use and the 26-34's for LSD use. The low figures for heroin use made age comparisons outside the predominant 18-25 group difficult. Figures from statewide studies (items 74, 75, 76, and 98) suggest that the group of adolescents under 18 years (14 to 17 years) may also be significant, at least during the years in which those surveys were conducted (1972 and 1973).

For the adolescents, percentages by grade in the numerous school surveys are good indicators of differences by age. Table 2 shows that the usage rates in junior high schools are generally lower than the corresponding rates in high schools for marijuana, LSD, Methedrine and amphetamines; but the contrast is less clear for barbiturates, cocaine and heroin. For inhalants, the pattern is clearly reversed--usage rates are higher in the junior high schools than in the high schools.

Observation of 25 of the school surveys showed that use of most drugs (except inhalants) increased with grade level (typically, grades 7-12). For inhalants, there was a tendency for use to peak in grade 9 (about age 15) and then to taper off somewhat. The pattern increases by age for the other drugs appeared most pronounced for marijuana and somewhat less noticeable for hallucinogens, amphetamines, barbiturates, and narcotics.

The patterns did not hold in all drug/grade categories. In a few cases, usage appeared to fall off slightly at the grade 12 level. The majority of the evidence, however, indicated an increasing trend by grade level for all drugs except inhalants. For the latter, the usage peak at grade 9 was supported by several surveys.

Table 1

Regional Variations in Percentages of Respondents
Who Have Ever Used the Indicated Drugs

Respondents by Regions	Type of Drug Used			
	Marijuana	LSD	Cocaine	Heroin
Adults, 1972 (Item 1)				
West	33	10.0	5.5	1.6
Northeast	24	2.3	2.0	1.6
North Central	15	6.0	4.6	1.2
South	8	1.9	1.4	0.9
Adults, 1971 (Item 3)				
West	21			
Northeast	20			
North Central	19			
South	5			
Youth, 1972 (Item 2)				
West	23.5	8.7	1.7	0.4
Northeast	15.3	3.8	1.6	0.3
North Central	13.1	4.4	1.5	0.0
South	7.0	3.8	1.4	1.4
Youth, 1971 (Item 3/Item 5)				
West	26/23			
Northeast	16/20			
North Central	13/13			
South	7/11			

Table 2

Regional Variations in Weighted Averages of Percentages of Respondents Who Have Ever Tried the Indicated Drugs (Item 28)

	Marijuana	LSD	Methedrine	Amphetamines
High Schools				
West Coast	42.9	14.7	13.3	21.0
East Coast	39.1	9.7	9.3	16.8
Midwest	37.6	10.9	12.5	14.6
Southeast	24.8	9.3	9.2	11.5
Junior High Schools				
West Coast	34.7	10.7	8.8	19.7
East Coast	12.6	4.4	3.5	6.7

	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Heroin	Inhalants
High Schools				
West Coast	21.1	[illegible]6	5.6	9.6
East Coast	19.2	8.2	6.0	10.8
Midwest	17.0	9.2	5.1	10.5
Southeast	12.5	8.6	6.1	9.5
Junior High Schools				
West Coast	22.9	9.0	5.0	15.5
East Coast	7.4	5.1	3.8	11.9

Comparisons by Sex

There were 30 surveys in which males' drug use could be compared with that of females. The most common occurrence was for males' use to exceed that of females. The exceptions were for amphetamines, barbiturates, "speed," and sedatives or tranquilizers, where females' use exceeded males' (items 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 31, and 50). Interestingly, in a study not abstracted here, females show up in larger numbers than males among adults using the ethical sedatives, stimulants, and tranquilizers for therapeutic rather than nonmedical purposes (Parry et al. 1971). In the younger groups, nonmedical use by males appeared to be only slightly higher than that by females, and even those slight differences are probably not statistically significant. It is possible at the junior high level for as many girls as boys to have been experimenting with the illegal drugs.

Comparisons by Sociodemographic Characteristics

Other characteristics of interest in comparisons of extent of drug use were socioeconomic status, racial or ethnic origin, and type of community. Scattered quantitative information on these characteristics appeared in a number of the surveys covered.

Information relating drug use to socioeconomic status or income was found in six surveys (items 43, 44, 46, 49, 74, and 75). The general impression was that drug use increases with the degree of affluence of the respondents. In three surveys, the data indicated that the extent of use of marijuana and other nonopiates peaks somewhat below the top of the socioeconomic scale, however that scale is defined.

Race or ethnic origin was examined in at least ten of the surveys covered (items 2, 3, 12, 31, 43, 74, 76, 79, 90, and 98). If differences existed, they were not clear from these data. Among adults in the 1972 nationwide survey data, nonwhites more often than whites reported that they had used marijuana, cocaine, or heroin; whereas whites more often reported having used LSD. This tendency was not borne out in Texas high schools (item 43), where Anglo students exceeded both black and Mexican-American students in marijuana use, and in North Carolina, where use by white students exceeded that by black students in every category (item 12). Nor was the tendency borne out in two other surveys (items 31 and 98) where black respondents exceeded whites in all drug categories. More blacks than whites reported use of opiates and volatile substances in four of six reports where such comparisons were possible. It seems obvious that more exploration of racial or ethnic differences must be made before a clear pattern is discernible.

Differences in community type were reported in several ways. References were made to metropolitan versus nonmetropolitan areas, to large versus medium versus small cities or rural areas, or to urban versus suburban or rural areas. In most studies and for most drugs, the usage figures were highest in the metropolitan or urban areas, lower in medium

or small cities and suburban areas, and lowest in rural areas. In one study, however, marijuana, LSD, and methamphetamine usages were highest in suburban areas and next highest in urban areas.

Other characteristics examined in various studies were religion, occupation, employment status, educational level, and marital status. Among the surveys covered, not enough evidence was available to attempt conclusions about differences shown by these characteristics. Special analyses of these data and of others to be collected are needed to cast light on such relationships if they exist.

Comparisons over Time

In a discussion of the extent of drug use or abuse, the question of greatest interest and practical importance often is whether it is increasing, decreasing, or remaining about the same. Reliable answers enable planners of prevention, rehabilitation, and education programs to commit resources efficiently. Unreliable answers can either scare parents, educators, and others unnecessarily or lull them into complacency.

Three types of surveys of drug use lend themselves to interpretation of time effects:

1. Those that measure characteristics of the same individuals over time, sometimes referred to as panel studies or follow-up studies;

2. Those that measure trends over time in the same types of groups, such as studies of grades 7-12, auto workers, or any group assumed to remain about the same in characteristics from one year to the next; and

3. Those that measure trends over time in the same defined population, such as adolescents aged 12 to 17 in the United States.

In all three types, the initial survey may be conducted on a sample of individuals. In the panel study, the same individuals are contacted in successive years; in the second and third types, successive samples (usually) of different individuals are taken. The trend studies of groups or populations are easier to maintain than panel studies, which always encounter the problems of sample attrition. Trend studies must ensure that sampling and the conditions of administration are consistent from one time to the next and that the groups themselves have not changed in ways that might affect the characteristic under study.

A number of surveys included in this compendium lent themselves to interpretation about changes in nonmedical drug use in recent years. They were those in which the measuring instrument (e.g., questionnaire or interview schedule) remained standard, and the individuals, groups, or populations were the same throughout. Unfortunately, none of the surveys

provided figures more recent than 1972. Included, however, were the nationwide sample surveys of the general population of the United States, which were more comprehensive than the available school or college surveys. The only panel studies for examination were conducted with student populations and among those, figures later than 1971 have not been reported.

Trend data on current or regular use is not available in the pertinent surveys. Data for those having "ever used" are much more common, but they leave many questions unanswered.

One trend is evidenced by comparison of marijuana figures from two nationwide studies (items 1, 2, and 3) of adults and youth:

Percentages of U.S. Population Who Ever Used Marijuana, 1971 and 1972

	1971	1972
Youth 12-17	14	13.4
Adults - 18 years	15	14.7

According to these figures, the extent of marijuana use appears to have stabilized for both age groups. Examination of subgroup figures in the abstracts also showed no discernible differences between those years.

Results of a nationwide panel study of college students at 48 colleges and universities illustrated the pitfalls of depending on such "ever used" figures for accurate estimates of changes (item 6). The "ever used" figures showed large, consistent increases in every category of drugs between 1969-1970 and 1970-1971. One would not expect any decreases in a panel study, of course, because the data represent cumulative use by individuals. At another level of use, "during the academic year," increases occurred but not in all categories of drugs: (1) narcotic cough syrups and "special substances" did not increase, (2) increases for recent use of marijuana and hashish were pronounced, (3) increases for other drug categories were smaller, and (4) all increases in use during the ensuing year were smaller than those in the "ever used" figures. This is good evidence that some portion of the increase in the "ever used" figures was due to experimental or one-time use.

The figures reflecting changes in "regular" use among the students in the nationwide panel study were even more revealing. The percentages using regularly, except for marijuana and hashish, were less than 3 percent, and the increases, where they occurred, involved less than 1 percent of the respondents. Five categories of drugs showed the same or lower rates the second year: opium, heroin, other narcotics, narcotic cough syrups, and special substances. For marijuana and hashish, however, all levels of use, "any use in one's lifetime," "during the past year," and "regular use," increased rather heavily among college students between those two years.

The question arises as to whether the nationwide figures indicating stabilization of marijuana use in 1972, and the student panel data indicating sharp increases in that same period, can be reconciled. They can be reconciled if one considers the fact that college students make up only about 3% of the population. Even an increase in drug use as large as 50% in this group does not drastically affect the nationwide rate. Thus, the national usage pattern can appear stable while rates of small subgroups expand.

Among the trend surveys included in the compendium, the earliest and longest is the set from the junior and senior high schools of San Mateo County, California, conducted annually since 1968 (item 9). The survey technique used is typical of surveys made in high schools: all students present on the day of the survey fill out a questionnaire; the forms, terms, and methods remained standard over the years. Usage was defined in relation to a specific time period (the year preceding the survey). There appeared to be the following trends in the San Mateo data over the past 4 years:

1. For marijuana, the trend was a steady increase over the years 1970-73, though the rate of increase appeared to slow after 1971. Small decreases in some sex or grade categories could have resulted from random error.

2. For "any use during the past year" of LSD, about half the sex and grade categories showed an increase (sometimes small) between successive years. In the other half, some decreases between successive years were found. In the categories of heavier use (10 or more, 50 or more), the figures tended to be steady or even to decrease over the years 1970-73.

3. For amphetamines and barbiturates, there is evidence of a decrease between 1972 and 1973, and in some cases, decreases were earlier, between 1971 and 1972.

4. For heroin, many of the observed differences were so small they could have been due to random error. There was no evidence of a consistent trend.

Eight other surveys were abstracted in which comparisons over time could be made. Four were secondary school surveys (items 13, 14, 17, and 19). A number of the increases in current use (defined as "use during the past year") were relatively small between 1969-70 and 1971-72, and there were some decreases. The other four surveys were in colleges or universities (items 4, 6, 56, and 60). The tendencies in all four were toward increases, both in the "ever used" figures and the "use during the preceding 6 (or 12) months."

To summarize the available time-series data, the trends are not clear-cut. Marijuana use appears to have stabilized for the population as a whole, but not for college students. When the portion of users considered "current" or "regular" was considered, most changes were positive but small.

COMMENTS ON SURVEY METHODS

Selection, application, and improvements in methods of surveying drug use serve one goal: to achieve as true an estimate as possible of the phenomenon in the defined group or population of individuals. Biases in an estimate can arise from a number of sources discussed in this section. Certain general principles or requirements can be followed to insure the best approximation to a true estimate. The aspects of surveying which are of primary concern are sampling, nonresponse bias, anonymity, questionnaire preparation, and the administration of questionnaires.

Sampling

Generally speaking, the abstracted reports provided little detail on the sampling techniques used. Available information was indicated briefly in the "Notes" on the abstracts. Some reports contained helpful discussions of the extent to which the samples were representative of the target population and supported the discussion with comparisons of social and demographic characteristics of the population and the sample. Some samples were selected purposively, in order to accomplish specific objectives of the investigators.

A fairly common practice in conducting drug use surveys in high schools has been to give questionnaires to all students who are present on the day of the survey and to excuse those who do not wish to participate. Even when random samples were drawn, students were excused on their own request or that of their parents. Concerns over human rights and new requirements for informed consent are widespread and have resulted in nearly universal practice of voluntary participation. (Voluntary does not imply volunteer participation, however; in most cases, subjects are expected to participate unless they refuse or object.) Methodological studies are needed to determine how much (if any) bias is introduced by voluntary participation.

In several studies, data were obtained by quota sampling, rather than random or probability sampling. In one variety of quota sampling, the population is divided into areas, and a specified number of those areas is randomly chosen for the sample; within each chosen area, a subsample of blocks, districts, or wards is taken, and within each of these an interviewer is assigned a quota of interviews to complete. Unless directed otherwise, the interviewer selects the sample members. This deviation from the principle of fully random selection is likely to result in sampling bias and margins of sampling error (predicated on random procedures) cannot be estimated.

Quota samples in household interview surveys often overrepresent the retired, the unemployed, families with small children, and others who are likely to be at home when an interviewer calls. The young, the single or divorced, the large-city dwellers, the employed females, and others who are likely to be away from home during the day are underrepresented. Underrepresentation of the young and the large-city dwellers will almost certainly bias the estimates of drug use in a downward direction.

Sample Size

In many of the reports, statements were made to the effect that the sample constituted a stated percentage of the target population. There was little or no discussion of the rationale for the particular sample size selected, however. Good practice in sample survey methodology requires that the determination of sample size be based on the precision desired in the estimates. The final decision is usually a tradeoff or compromise between desired precision and the constraints of available resources. There was little evidence in the reports abstracted that sample size was based on a desired precision in the estimates. (It must be pointed out that the important consideration is the absolute size of the sample, not the fact that it constituted "x" percent of the population.)

Nonresponse Bias

Bias due to nonresponse is the most serious problem encountered in surveys for information on sensitive issues. It is difficult to cope with because the basic right of the individual to refuse to volunteer personal information must be respected. In surveys of drug abuse in the school systems, the following can be important sources of bias due to nonresponse:

1. Absenteeism on the day of the survey,

2. Failure of some of those present to return questionnaires, and

3. Discarding of questionnaires by the researcher because of incomplete responses, inconsistencies, obviously frivolous responses, and the like.

The same considerations apply, in varying extents, to surveys made in universities and in other populations. As long as the researcher has no information on those who failed or refused to respond, he cannot estimate either the extent or the direction of the bias due to nonresponse.

On the positive side, one can say that if a researcher has a random sample or a probability sample from his target population and if the rate of nonresponse is relatively low, the bias due to nonresponse will be relatively low. However, to go beyond this and try to estimate either the direction or the extent of the bias without quantitative information on the nonrespondents is risky. Subjective judgment of the "representativeness" of samples or the probable effects of nonresponse will not solve the quantitative problem.

Response Validity

Most investigators have assumed that assurance of confidentiality of data was critical for validity of responses about nonmedical drug use, primarily because of its illicit or illegal aspect. Generally, appropriate steps have been taken by investigators to preserve anonymity. One

surprising piece of evidence is that anonymity may not affect the validity of responses as severely as expected, at least among secondary school students: in a comparison of responses by students who either did or did not give their names, drug use was no higher in the anonymous group; in fact, it was slightly (but not significantly) higher in the group who identified themselves by names (Haberman et al. 1972). Thus, assurance of anonymity may not be as critical as assumed for certain groups, but it is still an advisable precaution against violation of confidentiality.

Many of the questionnaires used in the surveys included checks on the validity and reliability of responses. These included (1) efforts to detect consistent overstatement or understatement of usage, (2) questions asked in more than one way to detect logically inconsistent responses, (3) requests that the respondents indicate the degree of accuracy with which they have completed the questionnaire, and (4) questions about usage of mythical or nonexistent drugs.

In evaluating consistent overstatement or understatement, the researcher looks for responses outside a range that he considers reasonable on the basis of knowledge or experience. (This is essentially the same as detecting outliers in statistical distributions.) Such evaluation procedures have merit if applied with caution and judgment and within limits (i.e., not to the point of accepting poorly collected data or rejecting unusual findings).

Logically inconsistent responses are apparent when the respondent answers two related questions in such a way that both answers cannot be correct (i.e., the respondent contradicts himself). If the number of responses that are consistently too high, consistently too low, or logically inconsistent constitutes a small percentage of the total number of responses, the researcher can conclude that the estimates will not be seriously affected. If a relatively large number of responses have these deficiencies, something is probably wrong with the survey.

Occasionally respondents are asked to make a self-appraisal of the accuracy of their own responses. This can be useful when results are inconsistent, but positive answers do not assure validity. Perhaps, preferable to a self-appraisal question is the one asked about a mythical or nonexistent drug. In methodological studies of high school students, reported use of a fictitious drug, "Eljoz," was correlated with higher reported use of real drugs (Elinson 1973a).

Other types of validity checks require efforts beyond the questionnaire construction methods mentioned above. For example, urinalysis can be used to validate recent use of certain drug types (opiates, amphetamines, and barbiturates). Comparison with records from other sources is another method. Research is sorely needed to improve methods and increase confidence in epidemiological data from surveys.

Questionnaire Preparation and Administration

Some of the reports collected for this compendium included a copy of the questionnaire used; others did not. From those available, it appeared that most researchers designed the form to satisfy their own needs and objectives and that the approaches to questionnaire development were haphazard and subjective. Questions were asked in sufficiently different ways to render comparisons of the responses nearly impossible.

There was little information on whether or not questionnaires were pretested before use. Pretesting would have enabled researchers to clarify ambiguities in the questions and to foresee and eliminate other difficulties designed into the forms. Operational definitions, presently being addressed in a project, hopefully will lead to efforts for consistency and comparability of results (Elinson 1973b).

Arrangements for administering questionnaires also varied considerably. Responses can easily be affected by administrative procedures; for example, prior announcement of the day and time of a drug use survey may affect the spontaneity of responses and the class absences. Drug use is known to vary significantly between those present or absent from school: use is much higher among absentees (Elinson 1973a).

Methodological Requirements

When assessing the extent of the drug abuse problem, there are temptations to interpret published results as if they were applicable to wider populations than those surveyed. For the reasons discussed above, generalizations or comparisons of results, apart from the total context in which those results were obtained, should be approached with caution.

Reliable, valid estimates for generalization to wider groups and populations are possible if the following requirements are met:

1. A random sample or a probability sample should be drawn from the target population.

2. The sample size should be a compromise between the desired precision of estimates and the resources available for the survey.

3. Bias due to nonresponse should be estimated from statistically acceptable data.

4. The questionnaire should be carefully designed and pretested prior to use in the actual survey.

5. Validity checks should be chosen carefully so as to avoid misleading information.

6. The protocol for the administration of the questionnaire should be carefully worked out so that respondents are properly informed about all relevant aspects of the survey. If the questionnaire is administered to different subsets of the sample by different people, steps should be taken to assure uniform adherence to the administrative protocol.

In addition to the above, it is desirable from a statistical point of view that published estimates include an indication of the range of variability in those estimates, such as a statistical confidence interval. If estimates are to be obtained for comparisons between populations, these general requirements should be met uniformly over the set of populations to be compared.

CITED REFERENCES

Berg, D. 1970. Illicit use of dangerous drugs in the United States: a compilation of studies, surveys, and polls. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Berg, D. and Broecker, L. 1972. Illicit use of dangerous drugs in the United States: a compilation of studies, surveys, and polls. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Elinson, J. 1973a. A study of teenage drug behavior. Progress Report, NIDA Grant No. DA00043. Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

_____ 1973b. Operational definition of terms in drug use research. SAODAP grant. Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Haberman, P. W.; Josephson, E.; Zanes, A.; and Elinson, J. 1972. High school drug behavior: a methodological report on pilot studies. Eds. S. Einstein and S. Ollen. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys. Farmingdale, N.Y.: Baywood Publishing Company.

Parry, H.; Balter, M.; Mellinger, G.; Cisin, I.; and Manheimer, D. 1973. National patterns of psychotherapeutic drug use. Archives of General Psychiatry 28: 769-783.

APPENDIX A

ABSTRACTS
NATIONWIDE SURVEYS
ITEM NOS. 1-8

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Marijuana	LSD	Cocaine	Heroi
					Percentage of Weighted Frequenc			
National cross-section of adults 1972.	Nationwide	Self-admin. question-naire	2411	All Adults	14.7	4.6	3.2	1.3
			1023	Sex: Male	22	7.2	4.5	1.8
			1388	Female	10	2.2	1.9	0.8
			378	Age: 18-21		22.0	12.3	7.6
			394	22-25		14.0	5.4	1.3
			390	26-29		6.0	5.1	1.7
			772	18-25		18.2	9.1	4.6
			562	26-34		3.7	4.5	1.7
			441	35-49		0.1	0.7	
			590	50 & over		0.2	0.7	
				Education				
			700	Less than H.S. grad.	5	1.1	0.7	0.8
			810	H.S. grad.	13	3.0	3.8	1.6
			873	College or more	32	10.4	5.4	1.5
				Region				
			532	Northeast	14	2.3	2.0	1.6
			692	North Central	15	6.0	4.6	1.2
			802	South	8	1.9	1.4	0.9
				West	33	10.0	5.5	1.6
				Race				
			2224	White	15	4.8	2.8	1.0
			187	Other	21	3.3	5.3	3.0
				Community Type				
			682	Large Metro	21	3.6	4.5	1.7
			906	Other Metro	20	7.6	3.6	1.6
			823	Non-Metro	5	1.7	1.2	0.4
				Marijuana Exper.				
			477	Yes	100.0	28.6	16.3	8.0
			1934	No	0.0	0.1	0.7	*
			234	Marijuana Users	100.0	48.2	29.9	12.4

* less than 0.05 percent

REFERENCE

Response Analysis Corporation, "Drug Experience, Attitudes and Related Behavior Among Adolescents and Adults: Detailed Tabulations, Part 2C. Experience Data." A Nationwide Study for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1973.

NOTES

The data on LSD, cocaine, and heroin presented above are taken from th groups in the Drug Experience Tables 1 and 2 in the Adult section of this r "inhalants" refers to "glue or other things you breathe in for pleasure", a for "All Adults" is the result of combining the data over all time periods The "All Adults" figure for marijuana is obtained by combining appropriate in Table 43. The corresponding figure for current users of marijuana is 7. marijuana by sex, education, region, race, and community type were provided Analysis Corporation in a private communication. Detailed breakdowns by th are not given for inhalants in this report.

Item No. 1

ed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Percentage of Weighted Frequencies: Marijuana	LSD	Cocaine	Heroi	Inhalants
	Nationwide	Self-admin.	2411	All Adults	14.7	4.6	3.2	[illegible]	2.1
		question-	1023	Sex: Male	22	7.2	4.5	1.8	
		naire	1388	Female	1)	2.2	1.9	0.8	
			378	Age: 18-21		22.0	12.3	7.6	
			394	22-25		14.0	5.4	1.3	
			390	26-29		6.0	5.1	1.7	
			772	18-25		18.2	9.1	4.6	
			562	26-34		3.7	4.5	1.7	
			441	35-49		0.1	0.7		
			590	50 & over		0.2	0.7		
				Education					
			700	Less than H.S. grad.	5	1.1	0.7	0.8	
			810	H.S. grad.	13	3.0	3.8	1.6	
			873	College or more	32	10.4	5.4	1.5	
				Region					
			532	Northeast	14	2.3	2.0	1.6	
			692	North Central	15	6.0	4.6	1.2	
			802	South	3	1.9	1.4	0.9	
			385	West	33	10.0	5.5	1.6	
				Race					
			2224	White	13	4.8	2.8	1.0	
			187	Other	21	3.3	5.3	3.0	
				Community Type					
			682	Large Metro	21	3.6	4.5	1.7	
			906	Other Metro	2)	7.6	3.6	1.6	
			823	Non-Metro	5	1.7	1.2	0.4	
				Marijuana Exper.					
			477	Yes	100.0	28.6	16.3	8.0	
			1934	No	0.0	0.1	0.7	*	
			234	Marijuana Users	100.0	48.2	29.9	12.4	

* less than 0.05 percent

s Corporation, "Drug Experience,
lated Behavior Among Adolescents
tailed Tabulations, Part 2C.
" A Nationwide Study for the
ion on Marihuana and Drug Abuse
lysis Corporation, Princeton,
ary 1973.

NOTES

The data on LSD, cocaine, and heroin presented above are taken from the corresponding "Yes" groups in the Drug Experience Tables 1 and 2 in the Adult section of this report. The term "inhalants" refers to "glue or other things you breathe in for pleasure", and the figure cited for "All Adults" is the result of combining the data over all time periods cited in Table 98. The "All Adults" figure for marijuana is obtained by combining appropriate response categories in Table 43. The corresponding figure for current users of marijuana is 7.8%. The data on marijuana by sex, education, region, race, and community type were provided by the Response Analysis Corporation in a private communication. Detailed breakdowns by the above user categories are not given for inhalants in this report.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
National cross-section of youth, ages 12-17, 1972.	Nationwide	Self-admin. question-naire	880
			433
			447
			277
			288
			313
			194
			262
			321
			103
			261
			295
			324
			125
			755

Ever Used	Percentage of Weighted Frequ			H
	Marijuana	LSD	Cocaine	
All Youth	13.4	4.8	1.5	
Sex: Male	14.3	4.4	1.7	
Female	12.4	5.4	1.5	
Age: 12-13	3.2	1.1	0.2	
14-15	9.7	5.3	2.3	
16-17	28.3	8.5	2.3	
Region				
Northeast	15.3	3.8	1.6	
North Central	13.1	4.4	1.5	
South	7.0	3.8	1.4	
West	23.5	8.7	1.7	
Community Type				
Large Metro	17.6	4.7	0.9	
Other Metro	17.4	7.8	2.5	
Non-Metro	5.9	2.4	1.2	
Marijuana Exper.				
Yes	100.0	30.1	10.7	
No	0.0	0.7	0.1	

REFERENCE

Response Analysis Corporation, "Drug Experience, Attitudes and Related Behavior Among Adolescents and Adults: Detailed Tabulations, Part 2C. Experience Data." A Nationwide Study for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1973.

NOTES

The data on LSD, cocaine, and heroin presented above are taken from groups in Table 72 in the Youth section of this report. The term "inhala other things that you breathe in for pleasure", and the figure cited for result of combining the data over all time periods cited in Table 66. Th are obtained by combining appropriate figures within age groups in Table figure for current users of marijuana, "All Youth" is 7.3%, found by comb categories in Table 23.

rveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Percentage of Weighted Frequencies: Marijuana	LSD	Cocaine	Heroin	Inhalants
s-	Nationwide	Self-admir.	880	All Youth	13.4	4.8	1.5	0.6	6.5
uth,		question-	433	Sex: Male	14.3	4.4	1.7	0.4	
972.		naire	447	Female	12.4	5.4	1.5	0.7	
			277	Age: 12-13	3.2	1.1	0.2	0.2	
			288	14-15	9.7	5.3	2.3	0.4	
			313	16-17	28.3	8.5	2.3	1.1	
				Region					
			194	North East	15.3	3.8	1.6	0.3	
			262	North Central	13.1	4.4	1.5	0.0	
			321	South	7.0	3.8	1.4	1.4	
			103	West	23.5	8.7	1.7	0.4	
				Community Type					
			261	Large Metro	17.6	4.7	0.9	0.0	
			295	Other Metro	17.4	7.8	2.5	0.9	
			324	Non-Metro	5.9	2.4	1.2	0.8	
				Marijuana Exper.					
			125	Yes	100.0	30.1	10.7	1.5	
			755	No	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.4	

ysis Corporation, "Drug Experience, Related Behavior Among Adolescents Detailed Tabulations, Part 2C. ta." A Nationwide Study for the ission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse nalysis Corporation, Princeton, anuary 1973.

NOTES

The data on LSD, cocaine, and heroin presented above are taken from the corresponding "Yes" groups in Table 72 in the Youth section of this report. The term "inhalants" refers to "glue or other things that you breathe in for pleasure", and the figure cited for "All Youth" is the result of combining the data over all time periods cited in Table 66. The data for marijuana are obtained by combining appropriate figures within age groups in Table 22. The corresponding figure for current users of marijuana, "All Youth" is 7.3%, found by combining over the use categories in Table 23.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents Marijuana Ever Used	Marijuana Use Now	
National cross-section of adults and youth. 1971.	Nation de	Interview and self-admin. questionnaire	2,405	Adults:	All adults:	15	5	Household occupation
					Sex:			Professional/techni
					Men	21	7	Manager/official
					Women	10	3	Sales
								Clerical
					Age:			
					18-25	39	17	Craftsmen/foremen
					26-34	19	5	Operatives
					35-39	13	1	Service workers
					40-49	7	0	Laborers
					50-59	6	0	
					60 or older	4	0	Farmers
					Race:			Income: (family)
					White	15	5	$4,999 or less
					Negro	14	3	$5,000 - $9,999
					Other	16	7	$10,000 - $14,999
								$15,000 - $24,999
					Education:			$25,000 or more
					8th grade or less	5	0	
					Some high school	11	3	Region:
					High school graduate	14	4	Northeast
					Some college	25	8	North Central
					College graduate or beyond	21	6	South
					Now a student	44	23	West
					Religion:			Population density:
					Catholic	21	7	Large metropolitan
					Protestant	12	3	Smaller metropolit
					Jew	29	10	Nonmetropolitan ar
					Marital Status:			Type of area:
					Never married	36	17	City or town
					Now married	11	2	Suburbs
					Divorced or separated	22	11	Rural or other non
					Widowed	3	0	
		Self-admin. questionnaire	781	Youth	All youth:	14	6	Living Arrangement:
					Sex:			Living with both pa
					Male	14	7	Some other living a
					Female	14	5	
								Region:
					Age:			Northeast
					12	5		North Central
					13	7		South
					14	7		West
					15	13		
					16	23		Population density:
					17	33		Large metropolitan
								Smaller metropolita
								Nonmetropolitan are
					Education:			
					8th grade or less	8	4	
					9th and 10th grades	17		
					11th and 12th grades	30		

REFERENCE

Abelson, Herbert; Cohen, Reuben; and Schrayer, Diane, "Public Attitudes Toward Marihuana, Part I: Main Report". A Nationwide Study of Beliefs, Information and Experience prepared for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1972. In Marihuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding, March 1972, Volume II, pp. 856-968, GPO Stock Number 5266-0002, $10.75 per two-volume set.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in Chapter 4 report. Some of the data for Youth were inferred from Table 197 in Pa tions of the report (not published in the main report cited on the lef a nationwide probability sample of adults, and a sample of young peopl data found in this chapter pertain to frequency of marijuana usage by experience with it, circumstances of first use, reasons fo terminatin those who have had experience with it, behavioral correlates of mariju tion about usage if marijuana were legal.

Item No. 3

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents Marijuana Ever Used	Marijuana Use Now		Ever Used	Use Now
Nationwide	Interview and self-admin. questionnaire	2,405	Adults:	All adults:	15	5	Household occupation:		
				Sex:			Professional/technical	22	7
				Men	21	7	Manager/official	14	4
				Women	10	3	Sales	18	5
							Clerical	21	12
				Age:					
				18-25	39	17	Craftsmen/foremen	15	4
				26-34	19	5	Operatives	15	3
				35-39	13	1	Service workers	15	5
				40-49	7	0	Laborers	19	9
				50-59	6	0			
				60 or older	4	0	Farmers	2	1
				Race:			Income: (family)		
				White	15	5	$4,999 or less	12	4
				Negro	14	3	$5,000 - $9,999	16	4
				Other	16	7	$10,000 - $14,999	17	4
							$15,000 - $24,999	18	5
				Education:			$25,000 or more	15	7
				8th grade or less	5	0			
				Some high school	11	3	Region:		
				High school graduate	14	4	Northeast	20	7
				Some college	25	8	North Central	19	3
				College graduate or beyond	21	6	South	5	1
				Now a student	44	23	West	21	10
				Religion:			Population density:		
				Catholic	21	7	Large metropolitan area	20	7
				Protestant	12	3	Smaller metropolitan area	18	5
				Jew	29	10	Nonmetropolitan area	7	1
				Marital Status:			Type of area:		
				Never married	36	17	City or town	17	5
				Now married	11	2	Suburbs	15	6
				Divorced or separated	22	11	Rural or other nonsuburban	7	1
				Widowed	3	0			
	Self-admin. questionnaire	781	Youth	All youth:	14	6	Living Arrangement:		
				Sex:			Living with both natural parents	13	
				Male	14	7	Some other living arrangement	20	
				Female	14	5			
							Region:		
				Age:			Northeast	16	9
				12	5		North Central	13	5
				13	7		South	7	2
				14	7		West	26	11
				15	13				
				16	23		Population density:		
				17	33		Large metropolitan area	15	9
							Smaller metropolitan area	15	7
				Education:			Nonmetropolitan area	13	3
				8th grade or less	8	4			
				9th and 10th grades	17				
				11th and 12th grades	30				

aben; and Schrayer, Diane, "Public Attitudes Toward Marihuana, ationwide Study of Beliefs, Information and Experience prepared on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, ary 1972. In Marihuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding, March , GPO Stock Number 5266-0002, $10.75 per two-volume set.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in Chapter 4 (pp. 942-958) of this report. Some of the data for Youth were inferred from Table 197 in Part 2, Detailed Tabulations of the report (not published in the main report cited on the left). They are based on a nationwide probability sample of adults, and a sample of young people age 12-17. Other data found in this chapter pertain to frequency of marijuana usage by those who have had experience with it, circumstances of first use, reasons for terminating use of marijuana by those who have had experience with it, behavioral correlates of marijuana usage and speculation about usage if marijuana were legal.

Item No. 4

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Date Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Heroin
National cross-section of students in U.S. colleges and universities 1971.	Nationwide	Interview and question-naire	3000 (approx.)	Total	62	13	18	30	22	7	3
				Men	66						
				Women	56						
				Users Who Say They Will Stop	21	52	38	42	48	27	45
			Comparative Data	Ever Used: 1970 Total	47	11		18	15		
				Men	51						
				Women	39						

REFERENCE

Playboy, "Student Survey: 1971". Playboy, Vol. 18, No. 9, pp. 118, 208, 210, 212, 214, 216, September 1971.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data on drug use found in this paper. Blanks in the tabulation correspond to data not reported. In some cases, figures were inferred from statements made in the text. The data on marijuana for 1971 are broken down by the following categories of use: 1-3 times, 4-9 times, and 10 times and up; rough breakdowns are given for some of the other drugs.

Schools were selected randomly in the five geographical areas of the country, to represent the national average of public and private, large and small, urban and suburban colleges and universities. Students were selected to make up a nationally representative balance of males and females, freshmen through seniors, and the correct ratio of business, arts, education, science, agriculture, and other academic majors.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentages Based on Weighted Sample: Region: National	South	North Central	Northeast	West	Marijuana Age: 12-13 Years	14-15 Years	16-17 Years	Sex: Girls	Boys
Youngsters 12 to 17 years of age. May 1971.	Nation-wide	Interview	498	Nonusers	85	89	87	80	77					
				not interested in trying						87	74	64	78	72
				interested in trying						10	11	8	8	11
				Experimenters	9	9	7	13	10	3	11	14	8	11
				Occasional users	3	2	3	3	6	<1	3	5	4	2
				Frequent Users	3	<1	3	4	7	0	1	9	2	4

	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Have Tried Other Drugs: Glue	1 or 2 of the 5 drugs	3 or more of t
Nonusers of Marijuana	1	1	1	1	3	2	1
Marijuana users							
Experimenters	0	38	18	0	10	35	6
Occasional and frequent users	55	74	71	12	37	29	51

REFERENCE

Josephson, Eric; Haberman, Paul; Zanes, Anne; and Elinson, Jack, "Adolescent Marijuana Use: Report on a National Survey". Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 1-8, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug use found in this paper (Table based on a national household probability sample. A single youngster in sample was drawn at random to be interviewed. Weights were used to reduc varying completion rates. Confidentiality of the respondents was assured defined as those who had used marijuana no more than nine times, occasion had used it 10-59 times, and frequent users as those who had used it 60 o figures cited are based on a weighted sample of 1701 (the actual number i

Item No. 4

Geog. Region	Date Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Heroin
Nationwide	Interview and question-naire	3000 (approx.)	Total	62	13	18	30	22	7	3
			Men	66						
			Women	56						
			Users Who Say They Will Stop	21	52	38	42	48	27	45
		Comparative Data	Ever Used: 1970							
			Total	47	11		18	15		
			Men	51						
			Women	39						

y: 1971". Playboy,
, 208, 210, 212,
1.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data on drug use found in this paper. Blanks in the tabulation correspond to data not reported. In some cases, figures were inferred from statements made in the text. The data on marijuana for 1971 are broken down by the following categories of use: 1-3 times, 4-9 times, and 10 times and up; rough breakdowns are given for some of the other drugs.

Schools were selected randomly in the five geographical areas of the country, to represent the national average of public and private, large and small, urban and suburban colleges and universities. Students were selected to make up a nationally representative balance of males and females, freshmen through seniors, and the correct ratio of business, arts, education, science, agriculture, and other academic majors.

Item No. 5

Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentages Based on Weighted Sample: National	Region: South	North Central	Northeast	West	Marijuana Age: 12-13 years	14-15 Years	16-17 Years	Sex: Girls	Boys	Family Income: Under $10,000	$10,000-$14,999	$15,000 and over
Interview	498	Nonusers	85	89	87	80	77						94	86	81
		not interested in trying						87	74	64	78	72			
		interested in trying						10	11	8	8	11			
		Experimenters	9	9	7	13	10	3	11	14	8	11	4	11	9
		Occasional users	3	2	3	3	6	<1	3	5	4	2	2	1	6
		Frequent Users	3	<1	3	4	7	0	1	9	2	4	0	2	4

	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Have Tried Other Drugs: Glue	1 or 2 of the 5 drugs	3 or more of the 5 drugs
Nonusers of Marijuana	1	1	1	1	3	2	1
Marijuana users							
Experimenters	0	38	18	0	10	35	6
Occasional and frequent users	55	74	71	12	37	29	51

ul; Zanes, Anne; and Elinson, Jack, "Adolescent Marijuana Use:
. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student
rsey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 1-8, published, 1972 by
43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug use found in this paper (Tables 1 and 2). They are based on a national household probability sample. A single youngster in each household in the sample was drawn at random to be interviewed. Weights were used to reduce bias and adjust for varying completion rates. Confidentiality of the respondents was assured. Experimenters are defined as those who had used marijuana no more than nine times, occasional users as those who had used it 10-59 times, and frequent users as those who had used it 60 or more times. The figures cited are based on a weighted sample of 1701 (the actual number interviewed was 498).

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents										
					Marijuana	Hashish	Psychedelics LSD	Psychedelics Other	Amphetamines "Methedrine"	Amphetamines Other	Barbit./ Sedatives	Tranquilizers	Cocaine	Narcotics Opium	Narcotics Hero
Freshmen and juniors enrolled at 48 U. S. colleges in Autumn 1969	Nation-wide	Self-admin. anonymous questionnaire	7,948	1970	30.7	20.5	6.0	7.0	6.8	13.7	15.4	18.8	3.3	4.3	0.6
					31.2		8.6		16.8						
				Matched Sample											
			3,961	1970	27.6	18.4	4.5	5.6	5.2	12.3	15.8	19.6	2.6	3.4	0.5
					28.2		6.7		14.8						
			3,961	1971	41.6	27.6	7.7	10.3	9.1	18.4	22.4	27.3	4.5	5.0	0.8
					43.7		12.6		24.7						
				Use During Academic Year											
			7,948	1970	27.0	18.5	4.7	6.2	5.3	10.9	10.5	13.2	2.3	3.1	0.4
					27.6		7.4		12.9						
				Matched Sample											
			3,961	1969-70	23.6	16.2	3.4	4.9	3.8	8.5	9.7	13.0	1.6	2.3	0.3
					24.4		5.9		10.2						
			3,961	1970-71	37.3	23.2	5.2	7.9	6.5	12.5	12.4	16.2	2.3	2.9	0.6
					37.4		8.8		15.7						
				Regular Use											
			7,948	1970	13.6	7.3	0.9	1.1	1.1	3.2	1.5	2.8	0.1	0.2	0.0
					13.8		1.5		3.5						
				Matched Sample											
			3,961	1969-70	11.4	5.8	0.5	0.6	0.8	2.3	1.3	2.8	0.0	0.1	0.0
					11.8		0.7		2.9						
			3,961	1970-71	19.7	8.2	0.8	1.0	1.1	3.0	2.1	2.9	0.1	0.0	0.0
					19.8		1.2		3.5						
				Use During 1969-70 Academic Year											
				Small Schools	20.7				10.3		9.9				0.2
				Large Schools	31.7				14.4		10.8				0.5
				Low Selectivity	22.6				12.4		10.6				0.2
				High Selectivity	38.9				14.0		10.2				0.5
				Public	26.1				13.3		8.4				0.4
				Private, Non-sectarian	48.4				17.8		12.2				0.6
				Private, Affiliated	21.2				9.2		10.4				0.2

REFERENCE

Rossi, Peter H.; Groves, W. Eugene; and Grafstein, David, Life Styles and Campus Communities: A Report of a Survey of American Colleges and Universities (1969-70; 1970-71). Final report on research conducted under Grant MH16536 from the National Institute of Mental Health by Department of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins University, November 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of drug use found in this report (Tables 1-2, 1-4, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5). The term "special substances" includes catnip, glue, nutmeg, amyl nitrite, gasoline, etc., as well as some regular prescribed medicines. "Regular Use" is defined use at least every week or two during the academic year. An important feature of this study is presence of a subsample in which responses for two years were individually matched. The sampling frame included about three-fourths of the four-year college population of freshmen and juniors the time of the survey. Topics discussed in the report include individual transitions in drug drug use incidence by school, mode of use, factors affecting usage decisions, legal control of use, and student life styles and attitudes.

eyed	eog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hashish	Psychedelics: LSD	Other	Amphetamines: Methedrine	Other	Barbit./ Sedatives	Tranquilizers	Narcotics: Cocaine	Opium	Heroin	Other	Item No. 5: Narcotic Cough Syrups	Spec. Subst.
d	Nation-wide	Self-admin. anonymous questionnaire	7,948	1970	30.7	20.5	6.0	7.0	6.8	13.7	15.4	18.8	3.3	4.3	0.6	5.1	37.5	4.0
					31.2		8.6		16.8									
				Matched Sample														
			3,961	1970	27.6	18.4	4.5	5.6	5.2	12.3	15.8	19.6	2.6	3.4	0.5	4.6	38.2	4.2
					28.2		6.7		14.8									
			3,961	1971	41.6	27.6	7.7	10.3	9.1	18.4	22.4	27.3	4.5	5.0	0.8	7.0	44.2	6.0
					43.7		12.6		24.7									
				Use During Academic Year														
			7,948	1970	27.0	18.5	4.7	6.2	5.3	10.9	10.5	13.2	2.3	3.1	0.4	3.2	22.5	2.7
					27.6		7.4		12.9									
				Matched Sample														
			3,961	1969-70	23.6	16.2	3.4	4.9	3.8	8.5	9.7	13.0	1.6	2.3	0.3	2.8	22.6	3.0
					24.4		3.		10.2									
			3,961	1970-71	37.3	23.2	5.2	7.9	6.5	12.5	12.1	16.2	2.3	2.9	0.6	3.2	19.4	2.6
					37.4		8.8		15.7									
				Regular Use														
			7,948	1970	13.6	7.3	0.9	1.1	1.1	3.2	1.5	2.8	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.9
					13.8		1.5		3.5									
				Matched Sample														
			3,961	1969-70	11.4	5.8	0.5	0.6	0.8	2.3	1.3	2.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	1.0	1.3
					11.8		0.7		2.9									
			3,961	1970-71	19.7	8.2	0.8	1.0	1.1	3.0	2.1	2.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.0	1.1
					19.8		1.2		3.5									
				Use During 1969-70 Academic Year														
				Small Schools	20.7				10.3		9.9				0.2			
				Large Schools	31.7				14.4		10.8				0.5			
				Low Selectivity	22.6				12.4		10.6				0.2			
				High Selectivity	38.9				14.0		10.2				0.5			
				Public	26.1				13.3		8.4				0.4			
				Private, Non-sectarian	48.4				17.8		12.2				0.6			
				Private, Affiliated	21.2				9.2		10.4				0.3			

.; Groves, W. Eugene; and
id, Life Styles and Campus
A Report of a Survey of
ges and Universities
-71). Final report on
cted under Grant MH16536
nal Institute of Mental
rtment of Social Relations,
ins University, November

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of drug use found in this report (Tables 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5). The term "special substances" includes catnip, glue, nutmeg, amyl nitrite, gasoline, etc., as well as some regular prescribed medicines. "Regular Use" is defined as use at least every week or two during the academic year. An important feature of this study is the presence of a subsample in which responses for two years were individually matched. The sampling frame included about three-fourths of the four-year college population of freshmen and juniors at the time of the survey. Topics discussed in the report include individual transitions in drug use, drug use incidence by school, mode of use, factors affecting usage decisions, legal control of drug use, and student life styles and attitudes.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Marijuana	Estimated Percentage of Hallucinogens (LSD, mescaline)	Sti Dep
Students in 38 U. S. colleges and universities with student bodies of over 200, and five junior colleges, 1971).	Nationwide	Self-admin. anonymous question-naire	5,050	All Students	36.7	11.7	
				Northeast	44.4		
				South	26.7		
				Midwest	28.2		
				West	46.0		
				Large Schools	44.5		
				Small Schools	32.0		
				Public Schools	38.0		
				Private Schools	33.4		
				Nonsectarian	40.0		
				Protestant	19.0		
				Catholic	34.0		
				All-male Schools	57.5		
				All-female Schools	31.1		
				Co-educational Schools	33.9		
				Male Students	41.4		
				Female Students	24.5		
				School Selectivity			
				Most competitive	55.6		
				Very competitive	45.6		
				Competitive	32.5		
				Least competitive	23.2		
				Junior College	27.0		

REFERENCE

Bergen, Mary ...; Bergen, Kenneth J.; and Morse, Stanley J., "Correlates of Marijuana Use Among College Students." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1-16, 1972.

NOTES

Tabulated above are most of the data on the extent of drug
The terms "large" and "small" for school size refer respectivel
5,000 students and those with under 5,000. Percentages are als
marijuana use broken down by certain student characteristics.
of father, political and religious affiliations, social disaffi
aspirations and achievements, year in school, and major area of
fluence of the Vietnam war is discussed.

The results are based on a random sample from the indicate
schools, questionnaires were administered in a variety of ways,
mail, random distribution in dormitory rooms, administration to
classes, and administration by members of the psychology or soc
subsequent analyses of the data, method of administration did n
significant amounts of the variance in responses.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ever Used	Estimated Percentage of Population: Marijuana	Hallucinogens (LSD, Mescaline)	Stimulants and Depressants	Heroin and/or Cocaine
Students in 38 U. S. colleges and universities with student bodies of over 200, and five junior colleges, 1971.	Nationwide	Self-admin. anonymous questionnaire	5,050	All Students	36.7	11.7	8.2	1.9
				Northeast	34.4			
				South	26.7			
				Midwest	28.2			
				West	46.0			
				Large Schools	44.5			
				Small Schools	32.0			
				Public Schools	38.0			
				Private Schools	33.4			
				Nonsectarian	40.0			
				Protestant	19.0			
				Catholic	34.0			
				All-male Schools	57.5			
				All-female Schools	31.1			
				Co-educational Schools	33.9			
				Male Students	41.4			
				Female Students	24.5			
				School Selectivity				
				Most competitive	55.6			
				Very competitive	45.6			
				Competitive	32.5			
				Least competitive	23.2			
				Junior College	27.0			

REFERENCE

Bergen, Gary A.; Bergen, Kenneth J.; and Morse, Stanley J., "Correlates of Marijuana Use Among College Students." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1-16, 1972.

NOTES

Tabulated above are most of the data on the extent of drug use found in this paper. The terms "large" and "small" for school size refer respectively to schools with over 5,000 students and those with under 5,000. Percentages are also given in the paper for marijuana use broken down by certain student characteristics. These include education of father, political and religious affiliations, social disaffiliation, educational aspirations and achievements, year in school, and major area of study. The generic influence of the Vietnam war is discussed.

The results are based on a random sample from the indicated population. Within schools, questionnaires were administered in a variety of ways, including use of college mail, random distribution in dormitory rooms, administration to large heterogeneous classes, and administration by members of the psychology or sociology departments. In subsequent analyses of the data, method of administration did not prove to account for significant amounts of the variance in responses.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Boys starting tenth grade in public high schools in the continental U. S. in fall 1966 (class of 1969)	Nationwide	Individually administered questionnaire	1,571

	Percentage of Respo		
During High School Years	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamin
Nearly every day	1.4	0.4	0.8
Once or twice a week	4.9	0.7	1.1
Once or twice a month	4.1	1.7	1.8
3-10 times a year	3.8	1.6	2.6
Once or twice a year	6.6	2.4	3.7
Never used	79.3	93.1	90.0
During the Year After High School			
Nearly every day	2.6	0.2	0.2
Once or twice a week	6.9	1.0	1.5
Once or twice a month	7.8	3.0	3.0
3-10 times a year	5.9	3.1	4.2
Once or twice a year	11.0	4.1	5.0
Never used	65.7	88.7	86.1

REFERENCE

Johnston, Lloyd, Drugs and American Youth, A report from the Youth in Transition Project, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

NOTES

Cited above are the detailed data on drug use found in t and 2-2). Marijuana includes hashish; hallucinogens include etc.; amphetamines include pep pills, bennies, speed, and upp include yellow jackets, red devils, and downers. The two que above data were asked at the same time, which means that the retrospectively, a year after the majority of the class had g

In much of the discussion in the report, the use categor "regular use", "occasional use", and "experimental use", with combined into "more than experimental use" for all of the dru marijuana. Major topics discussed in the report include patt use, drug use patterns across time, attitudes of youth toward and intelligence related to drug use, drugs and the high scho taken after high school, and policy implications.

Item No. 8

	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	During High School Years	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
th	Nationwide	Individually	1,571	Nearly every day	1.4	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.3
igh		administered		Once or twice a week	4.9	0.7	1.1	0.5	0.3
		questionnaire		Once or twice a month	4.1	1.7	1.8	1.6	0.4
in				3-10 times a year	3.8	1.6	2.6	1.6	0.4
of				Once or twice a year	6.6	2.4	3.7	2.3	0.4
				Never used	79.3	93.1	90.0	93.7	98.2
				During the Year After High School					
				Nearly every day	2.6	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4
				Once or twice a week	6.9	1.0	1.5	0.7	0.4
				Once or twice a month	7.8	3.0	3.0	2.1	0.2
				3-10 times a year	5.9	3.1	4.2	2.0	0.3
				Once or twice a year	11.0	4.1	5.0	3.8	0.9
				Never used	65.7	88.7	86.1	91.2	97.7

Drugs and American Youth, A report from the
on Project, Institute for Social Research,
Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

NOTES

Cited above are the detailed data on drug use found in this report (Tables 2-1 and 2-2). Marijuana includes hashish; hallucinogens include LSD, mescaline, peyote, etc.; amphetamines include pep pills, bennies, speed, and uppers; and barbiturates include yellow jackets, red devils, and downers. The two questions yielding the above data were asked at the same time, which means that the first question was asked retrospectively, a year after the majority of the class had graduated.

In much of the discussion in the report, the use categories are abbreviated into "regular use", "occasional use", and "experimental use", with the first two of these combined into "more than experimental use" for all of the drug categories except marijuana. Major topics discussed in the report include patterns of multiple drug use, drug use patterns across time, attitudes of youth toward drug taking, background and intelligence related to drug use, drugs and the high school experience, paths taken after high school, and policy implications.

APPENDIX B

ABSTRACTS

SURVEYS OF HIGH SCHOOL POPULATIONS

ITEM NOS. 9-55

36

Percentage of Respondents

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Any Use During Past Year	Marijuana 1970	Marijuana 1971	Marijuana 1972	Marijuana 1973	LSD 1970	LSD 1971	LSD 1972	LSD 1973	Amphetamines 1970	Amphetamines 1971	Amphetamines 1972	Amphetamines 1973	Barbiturates 1970	Barbiturates 1971	Barbiturates 1972	Barbiturates 1973
Junior and senior high school students in San Mateo County, California Years 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973.	Pacific	Anonymous questionnaire	Males																
			Seventh Grade	9.9	17.6	17.2	20.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	4.0	3.7	5.3	5.2	3.6	3.4	5.8	5.1	5.
			Eighth Grade	22.5	29.1	33.3	34.3	4.9	6.3	7.1	7.6	9.5	10.9	12.0	7.5	9.6	11.0	10.7	9.
			Freshman	34.1	44.5	43.9	51.2	10.9	12.5	12.2	14.6	13.8	18.0	16.9	14.6	12.5	16.8	11.9	13.
			Sophomore	44.9	49.7	51.9	56.1	17.0	16.1	17.6	18.8	18.5	19.5	22.8	20.3	16.6	16.8	16.0	15.
			Junior	48.9	57.9	58.0	58.5	18.5	21.2	18.0	21.3	20.7	24.6	21.8	21.5	17.3	19.8	14.7	15.
			Senior	50.9	58.6	60.8	61.0	17.4	20.9	21.2	20.2	18.8	26.7	25.8	21.1	14.4	18.5	15.4	14.
			Females																
			Seventh Grade	12.6	12.6	13.2	15.0	0.9	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.8	5.9	6.1	2.7	3.1	5.4	4.8	4.
			Eighth Grade	25.8	26.4	29.2	31.5	4.0	6.2	6.4	7.1	8.2	13.1	14.6	7.8	7.7	12.2	11.1	10.
			Freshman	31.9	40.5	39.0	47.0	9.2	11.7	12.0	13.8	17.4	22.5	21.7	16.6	14.5	18.0	13.7	14.
			Sophomore	42.1	48.1	49.3	51.9	15.0	13.6	14.5	15.7	24.4	26.8	27.4	21.4	20.4	19.1	17.2	15.
			Junior	42.6	50.2	52.4	55.3	12.4	15.0	15.4	16.4	22.3	25.6	28.1	23.0	15.0	17.9	15.6	15.
			Senior	48.4	48.3	53.0	57.2	11.9	12.2	13.7	13.4	20.2	22.8	24.4	20.8	13.9	15.0	14.1	11.
			Used Ten or More Times During Year																
			Males																
			Seventh Grade	2.7	5.3	5.8	6.7	0.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.6	1.3	1.4	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.2	1
			Eighth Grade	10.3	14.6	17.2	16.3	4.9	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.8	3.5	3.4	2.4	2.3	3.7	3.0	2
			Freshman	19.6	26.2	26.8	31.9	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.8	4.2	6.3	5.3	5.3	3.9	5.5	3.2	5
			Sophomore	28.7	33.3	36.8	39.6	6.5	5.9	6.0	5.5	5.8	7.0	8.5	7.1	4.8	5.7	5.5	4
			Junior	34.1	42.3	41.2	43.3	7.3	8.7	6.0	7.0	8.2	10.6	9.2	7.8	6.6	7.7	5.1	4
			Senior	34.2	43.3	45.0	45.4	7.0	7.3	7.2	6.2	7.2	10.7	10.9	7.8	5.0	7.2	5.8	5
			Females																
			Seventh Grade	1.4	4.1	4.6	4.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.3	1.4	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8	0
			Eighth Grade	6.9	12.3	14.1	14.8	0.8	1.3	1.6	1.2	2.1	3.0	4.7	1.9	2.1	3.5	2.7	2
			Freshman	16.2	23.3	23.0	22.6	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.4	7.6	8.5	5.6	4.6	5.3	3.5	4
			Sophomore	26.3	31.0	32.2	32.9	4.8	4.1	4.3	3.0	9.3	11.0	11.1	8.5	7.7	6.2	5.3	4
			Junior	26.2	32.9	35.7	36.6	3.2	3.9	4.0	4.0	8.3	11	12.5	9.7	4.5	6.8	4.5	3
			Senior	15.3	30.5	35.5	37.8	2.6	3.0	3.5	3.5	7.8	10.	.4	9.9	4.6	5.3	4.0	5
			Used Fifty or More Times During Past Year																
			Males																
			Seventh Grade	NA	NA	NA	3.3	NA	NA	NA	0.6	NA	NA	NA	0.8	NA	NA	NA	0
			Eighth Grade	NA	NA	NA	9.8	NA	NA	NA	0.9	NA	NA	NA	1.2	NA	NA	NA	1
			Freshman	11.4	17.2	15.9	20.3	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.2	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.7	1.8	2.6	1.4	1
			Sophomore	19.2	23.2	25.5	27.9	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.6	3.1	2.3	2.5	2.8	2
			Junior	23.5	30.3	28.2	31.3	2.6	3.9	2.2	2.9	3.9	4.8	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	2.2	2
			Senior	22.0	31.9	31.7	32.4	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.6	3.4	5.6	5.4	4.4	2.4	3.7	2.8	2
			Females																
			Seventh Grade	NA	NA	NA	2.3	NA	NA	NA	0.4	NA	NA	NA	0.4	NA	NA	NA	0
			Eighth Grade	NA	NA	NA	7.5	NA	NA	NA	0.3	NA	NA	NA	0.6	NA	NA	NA	0
			Freshman	7.2	11.6	12.5	12.8	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.6	2.5	3.1	2.3	1.5	1.5	1.3	1
			Sophomore	14.0	17.0	19.1	18.8	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.5	3.8	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	2.3	1.9	1
			Junior	14.4	19.4	20.7	20.4	0.8	1.4	1.3	1.1	2.9	4.6	5.3	4.4	1.7	2.7	2.0	1
			Senior	15.3	18.5	20.4	20.4	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	2.7	4.3	4.9	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.4	1

NA = Information Not Available

REFERENCE

San Mateo County, California, Surveillance of Student Drug Use. Preliminary Summary-1973, The Research and Statistics Section, Department of Public Health and Welfare, 225 37th Avenue, San Mateo, California 94403, June 22, 1973.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data in this report on the use of illegal drugs obtained through surveys made in 1970, 1971, 1972, definitions and methodology. The report also gives corresponding figures for marijuana, LSD, and amphetamines for the years 19 of respondents were roughly in the range between 2,000 and 3,000 per class/sex group in each year. Apparently the technique us present on a given day in the participating schools. The questionnaire, reproduced in the report, is very short, requesting on to permit the making of tabulations of the type indicated above.

Particularly noteworthy in these surveys is the fact that usage is defined in relation to a specific time period (the y Also, the comparable nature of the surveys from year to year enables longitudinal comparisons to be made.

Item No. 9

Percentage of Respondents

Data Collection Technique	Any Use During Past Year	Marijuana				LSD				Amphetamines				Barbiturates				Heroin			
		1970	1971	1972	1973	1970	1971	1972	1973	1970	1971	1972	1973	1970	1971	1972	1973	1970	1971	1972	1973
Anonymous Questionnaire	Males																				
	Seventh Grade	9.9	17.6	17.2	20.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	4.0	3.7	5.3	5.2	3.6	3.4	5.8	5.1	5.3	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	22.5	29.1	33.3	34.3	4.9	6.3	7.1	7.6	9.5	10.9	12.0	7.5	9.6	11.0	10.7	9.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	34.1	44.5	43.9	51.2	10.9	12.5	12.2	14.6	13.8	18.0	16.9	14.6	12.5	16.8	11.9	13.7	NA	3.7	2.7	3.4
	Sophomore	44.9	49.7	51.9	56.1	17.0	16.1	17.6	18.8	18.5	19.5	22.8	20.3	16.6	16.8	16.0	15.4	NA	3.9	4.0	4.2
	Junior	48.9	57.9	58.0	58.5	18.5	21.2	18.0	21.3	20.7	24.6	21.8	21.5	17.3	19.8	14.7	15.6	NA	4.9	3.8	3.8
	Senior	50.9	58.6	60.8	61.0	17.4	20.9	21.2	20.2	18.8	26.7	25.8	21.1	14.4	18.5	15.4	14.3	NA	5.9	4.6	4.3
	Females																				
	Seventh Grade	12.6	12.6	13.2	15.0	0.9	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.8	5.9	6.1	2.7	3.1	5.4	4.8	4.7	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	25.8	26.4	29.2	31.5	4.0	6.2	6.4	7.1	8.2	13.1	14.6	7.8	7.7	12.2	11.1	10.7	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	31.9	40.5	39.0	47.0	9.2	11.7	12.0	13.8	17.4	22.5	21.7	16.6	14.5	18.0	13.7	14.0	NA	1.9	2.3	2.3
	Sophomore	42.1	48.1	49.3	51.9	15.0	13.6	14.5	15.7	24.4	26.8	27.4	21.4	20.4	19.1	17.2	15.5	NA	2.0	2.6	2.1
	Junior	42.6	50.2	52.4	55.3	12.4	15.0	15.4	16.4	22.3	25.6	28.1	23.0	15.0	17.9	15.6	15.6	NA	3.3	2.9	2.7
	Senior	48.4	48.3	53.0	57.2	11.9	12.2	13.7	13.4	20.2	22.8	24.4	20.8	13.9	15.0	14.1	11.8	NA	2.6	2.7	2.9
	Used Ten or More Times During Year																				
	Males																				
	Seventh Grade	2.7	5.3	5.8	6.7	0.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.6	1.3	1.4	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.2	1.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	10.3	14.6	17.2	16.3	4.9	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.8	3.5	3.4	2.4	2.3	3.7	3.0	2.5	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	19.6	26.2	26.8	31.9	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.8	4.2	6.3	5.3	5.3	3.9	5.5	3.2	5.3	NA	1.8	1.1	1.7
	Sophomore	28.7	33.3	36.8	39.6	6.5	5.9	6.0	5.5	5.8	7.0	8.5	7.1	4.8	5.7	5.5	4.4	NA	1.8	1.7	1.8
	Junior	34.1	42.3	41.2	43.3	7.3	8.7	6.0	7.0	8.2	10.5	9.2	7.8	6.6	7.7	5.1	4.7	NA	2.4	1.7	1.9
	Senior	34.2	43.3	45.0	45.4	7.0	7.3	7.2	6.2	7.2	10.7	10.9	7.8	5.0	7.2	5.8	5.4	NA	3.0	1.6	2.0
	Females																				
	Seventh Grade	1.4	4.1	4.6	4.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.3	1.4	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8	0.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	6.9	12.3	14.1	14.8	0.8	1.3	1.6	1.2	2.1	3.0	4.7	1.9	2.1	3.5	2.7	2.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	16.2	23.3	23.0	22.6	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.4	7.6	8.5	5.6	4.6	5.3	3.5	4.5	NA	0.7	0.9	0.9
	Sophomore	26.3	31.0	32.2	32.9	4.8	4.1	4.3	3.0	9.3	11.0	11.1	8.5	7.7	6.2	5.3	4.1	NA	0.8	0.8	0.6
	Junior	26.2	32.9	35.7	36.6	3.2	3.9	4.0	4.0	8.3	11.2	12.5	9.7	4.5	6.8	4.5	3.4	NA	1.1	1.1	0.8
	Senior	15.3	30.5	35.5	37.8	2.6	3.0	3.5	3.5	7.8	10.4	11.4	9.9	4.6	5.3	4.0	5.4	NA	1.1	1.0	0.9
	Used Fifty or More Times During Past Year																				
	Males																				
	Seventh Grade	NA	NA	NA	3.3	NA	NA	NA	0.6	NA	NA	NA	0.8	NA	NA	NA	0.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	NA	NA	NA	9.8	NA	NA	NA	0.9	NA	NA	NA	1.2	NA	NA	NA	1.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	11.4	17.2	15.9	20.3	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.2	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.7	1.8	2.6	1.4	1.9	NA	1.4	0.7	1.4
	Sophomore	19.2	23.2	25.5	27.9	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.6	3.1	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.3	NA	1.4	1.2	1.2
	Junior	23.5	30.3	28.2	31.3	2.6	3.9	2.2	2.9	3.9	4.8	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	2.2	2.4	NA	1.8	1.2	1.7
	Senior	22.0	31.9	31.7	32.4	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.6	3.4	5.6	5.4	4.4	2.4	3.7	2.8	2.1	NA	2.0	1.2	1.8
	Females																				
	Seventh Grade	NA	NA	NA	2.3	NA	NA	NA	0.4	NA	NA	NA	0.4	NA	NA	NA	0.3	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Eighth Grade	NA	NA	NA	7.5	NA	NA	NA	0.3	NA	NA	NA	0.6	NA	NA	NA	0.9	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Freshman	7.2	11.6	12.5	12.8	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.6	2.5	3.1	2.3	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.7	NA	0.5	0.7	0.7
	Sophomore	14.0	17.0	19.1	18.8	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.5	3.8	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	2.3	1.9	1.4	NA	0.5	0.6	0.4
	Junior	14.4	19.4	20.7	20.4	0.8	1.4	1.3	1.1	2.9	4.6	5.3	4.4	1.7	2.7	2.0	1.9	NA	0.7	0.7	0.7
	Senior	15.3	18.5	20.4	20.4	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	2.7	4.3	4.9	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.4	2.2	NA	0.6	0.6	0.7

NA = Information Not Available

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data in this report on the use of illegal drugs obtained through surveys made in 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973, using comparable definitions and methodology. The report also gives corresponding figures for marijuana, LSD, and amphetamines for the years 1968 and 1969. The numbers of respondents were roughly in the range between 2,000 and 3,000 per class/sex group in each year. Apparently the technique used was to survey all students present on a given day in the participating schools. The questionnaire, reproduced in the report, is very short, requesting only the information necessary to permit the making of tabulations of the type indicated above.

Particularly noteworthy in these surveys is the fact that usage is defined in relation to a specific time period (the year preceding the survey). Also, the comparable nature of the surveys from year to year enables longitudinal comparisons to be made.

Item No. 10

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in the ninth and eleventh grades in the Prince Georges County, Maryland Junior and Senior High Schools. May 1972.	South Atlantic	102-item self-admin. questionnaire	Grade 9: 1800 Grade 11: 798

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Narcotics	Glue
Never Tried						
Grade 9	73.7	90.1	85.6	85.8	96.3	89.5
11	59.7	85.2	81.6	83.1	92.4	89.1
Tried But Quit						
Grade 9	8.8	4.1	7.0	7.5	2.4	8.0
11	11.1	8.0	10.1	8.9	5.5	9.3
Use Once a Month						
Grade 9	7.2	1.0	5.4	5.1	0.6	1.6
11	11.1	4.4	5.4	5.8	1.1	0.9
Use Once a Week						
Grade 9	7.0	1.6	1.7	1.3	0.5	0.6
11	12.5	1.5	2.3	1.5	0.5	0.2
Use Every Day						
Grade 9	3.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
11	5.6	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.5

REFERENCE

Maida, Peter R., Parent-Peer Group Relationships and Teenage Drug Use. Final Progress Report on Public Health Service Small Research Grant No. RO3-DA-00148, Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, no date.

NOTES

The data presented above were derived from the numbers given in Table 5 of this report. Within each junior and senior high school in the school system, classes were selected randomly for administration of the questionnaire. The resulting samples constituted approximately 15 percent of the ninth grade and 8 percent of the eleventh grade student populations. Steps were taken to insure the anonymity of the respondents. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to the paper.

Item No. 11

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in grades 7-12 in 58 schools in 29 school districts in Utah. April 26, 1972.	Mountain	Anonymous questionnaire	Approximately 10,900*

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana (Hashish)	Hallucinogens (LSD, Mescaline, etc.)	Stimulants (Amphetamines, etc.)	Depressants (Sleeping Pills, etc.)	Hard Narcotics (Heroin, Opium, etc.)	Glue, Gas, Solvents
Never Used	81.6	93.0	89.3	87.1	97.6	90.8
Once	4.6	2.6	3.5	5.6	1.0	4.9
2-5 times	4.2	1.6	3.0	4.0	0.6	2.4
6-10 times	2.1	1.0	1.5	1.3	0.3	0.7
More than 10 times	7.5	1.8	2.8	2.1	0.5	1.2

* varies slightly by drug type

REFERENCE

Utah State Board of Education, "Utah 1972 Statewide Drug Assessment." Mimeo, 16 p., Utah State Board of Education, Division of General Education, 1400 University Club Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

NOTES

The usage categories in the data cited above correspond to the response choices for the question: "How often have you experimented with (the indicated) drugs?" Other questions for which responses are tabulated in the report pertain to recency of last use, age at which use was started, age at which use was stopped by those who were users and quit, and reasons for use or nonuse of drugs. Some of these questions served as internal checks on the reliability of the responses. The survey also obtained information on opinions regarding the dangers involved in drug use, knowledge of availability of drugs, locales in which drugs are most often used, and opinions regarding laws for the control of drugs.

The report states that schools participating in the assessment administered the survey instrument to all students at the same time without prior announcement. However, there is no indication of how the participating schools were selected. (A representative of the Utah State Board of Education has indicated, in a private communication, that schools within cooperating districts were randomly drawn.) Approximately 655 survey sheets were discarded because they were grossly inconsistent, defaced, incomplete, or had "disregard my answers" as the response to a question designed to check on response reliability.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
All junior and senior high school students in 44 public and private schools in the Charlotte/Mecklenburg community of North Carolina. March 15, 1972.	South Atlantic	Metropolitan	80-item self-admin. questionnaire	32,995

		Percentage of Responden			
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens (incl. LSD)	Amphet-amines	Barbit-urates	Op
Ever Used: Gr. 7	9.1	4.2	5.5	4.0	
Gr. 8	17.1	8.5	11.3	8.6	
Gr. 9	26.1	12.9	15.9	12.0	
Gr. 10	30.0	14.1	17.9	13.8	
Gr. 11	34.7	14.4	18.5	13.5	
Gr. 12	39.6	16.9	19.5	13.7	
Total	24.5	11.2	14.0	10.6	
Over a Year Since Last Used					
Gr. 7	1.7	1.1	1.7	1.2	
Gr. 8	2.4	1.6	2.2	1.9	
Gr. 9	3.6	1.8	2.8	2.5	
Gr. 10	3.6	2.4	3.8	2.7	
Gr. 11	4.3	2.9	4.0	2.9	
Gr. 12	4.7	3.4	4.5	3.6	
Sex: Male	29.2	13.2	15.3	12.0	
Female	20.1	9.4	12.9	9.0	
Race: Black	18.2	5.8	7.2	7.1	
White	26.2	12.5	16.0	11.2	
Frequency of Use:					
Have Tried	9.0	5.2	6.7	5.6	
Use Occasionally	7.7	3.4	4.5	3.1	
Use Frequently	7.8	2.6	2.8	1.9	

REFERENCE

McLeod, Jonnie H. and Grizzle, Gloria A., Alcohol and Other Drug Usage Among Junior and Senior High School Students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Prepared for Community Drug Action Committee, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, by the Institute of Government, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Charlotte Drug Education Center, Charlotte, North Carolina, June 19, 1972.

NOTES

This survey was based on responses received from students who were day and were willing to participate. Appropriate steps were taken to respondents and also of schools. The analysis of the data included p of logically inconsistent responses, and for the detection of consist statement of usage. Some comparisons with relevant 1969 data are giv on "Ever Used" and "Over a Year Since Last Used" enable some conclusi of users who have stopped using drugs. Some attention is given in th

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	School Level	Usage	Percentage of Respondents							
							Marijuana		LSD		Amphetamines		Barbiturates	
							1969	1972	1969	1972	1969	1972	1969	1972
All students Grades 7-12 in the Montgomery County, Maryland, Public Schools. January 1972	South Atl.	Not Stated	251-item self-admin. questionnaire	2,922	Junior High	Never Used	93.3	87.0	96.7	96.4	96.4	95.9	96.7	96.1
						Tried but Quit	2.7	5.2	0.7	1.3	1.1	2.0	0.8	1.5
						Once/Month	1.5	3.2	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.8	0.3	1.1
						Once/Week	0.6	1.6	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.7
						Every Day	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1
						No Response	1.8	0.4	2.2	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.2	0.5
					Senior High	Never Used	79.7	58.7	92.1	85.7	90.3	84.7	90.8	85.4
						Tried but Quit	7.3	14.5	2.2	8.8	4.5	8.9	4.8	8.3
						Once/Month	4.3	10.9	2.1	2.8	2.1	3.4	1.9	3.5
						Once/Week	4.3	10.8	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.2	1.3
						Every Day	2.8	4.5	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.2
						No Response	1.6	0.6	2.2	1.3	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.3

(Marijuana usage was reported by specific grade and by sex for the t

REFERENCE

Elseroad, Homer O. and Goodman, Samuel M., Teenagers' Attitudes Toward the Use of Drugs, Alcohol, and Cigarettes. Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland, August 31, 1972.

NOTES

This survey was based on a 5 percent random sample from the targ stratified by school, grade, sex, and attendance sections. The par respondents had the opportunity to withdraw their children if they were taken to assure the students that no one was selected for perso anonymity of the individual respondents was preserved. Internal che and credibility of the results were built into the questionnaire. A this report is the comparison between the 1972 data and the results which was conducted in an essentially identical manner.

Item No. 12

Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens (incl. LSD)	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Opiates	Inhalants	Used Needle
South Atlantic	Metropolitan	80-item self-admin. questionnaire	32,995	Ever Used: Gr. 7	9.1	4.2	5.5	4.0	3.3	18.7	
				Gr. 8	17.1	8.5	11.3	8.6	5.1	19.7	
				Gr. 9	26.1	12.9	15.9	12.0	6.8	20.8	
				Gr. 10	30.0	14.1	17.9	13.8	7.6	17.4	
				Gr. 11	34.7	14.4	18.5	13.5	7.0	13.5	
				Gr. 12	39.6	16.9	19.5	13.7	7.5	11.9	
				Total	24.5	11.2	14.0	10.6	6.0	17.5	
				Over a Year Since Last Used:							
				Gr. 7	1.7	1.1	1.7	1.2	1.1	7.9	
				Gr. 8	2.4	1.6	2.2	1.9	1.2	7.8	
				Gr. 9	3.6	1.8	2.8	2.5	1.7	9.1	
				Gr. 10	3.6	2.4	3.8	2.7	1.7	9.1	
				Gr. 11	4.3	2.9	4.0	2.9	1.5	8.0	
				Gr. 12	4.7	3.4	4.5	3.6	1.7	7.2	
				Sex: Male	29.2	13.2	15.3	12.0	7.5	20.1	6.3
				Female	20.1	9.4	12.9	9.0	4.6	15.0	3.2
				Race: Black	18.2	5.8	7.2	7.1	5.0	12.7	6.1
				White	26.2	12.5	16.0	11.2	5.9	18.9	3.9
				Frequency of Use:							
				Have Tried	9.0	5.2	6.7	5.6	3.4	12.3	
				Use Occasionally	7.7	3.4	4.5	3.1	1.4	3.3	
				Use Frequently	7.8	2.6	2.8	1.9	1.2	1.9	

zzle, Gloria A., Alcohol and Other Drug Usage Among Junior and
ts in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Prepared for Community Drug Action
lenburg, North Carolina, by the Institute of Government, University
l Hill and Charlotte Drug Education Center, Charlotte, North

NOTES

This survey was based on responses received from students who were in attendance on the given day and were willing to participate. Appropriate steps were taken to preserve the anonymity of respondents and also of schools. The analysis of the data included procedures for the detection of logically inconsistent responses, and for the detection of consistent understatement or overstatement of usage. Some comparisons with relevant 1969 data are given in the report. The data on "Ever Used" and "Over a Year Since Last Used" enable some conclusions to be drawn about numbers of users who have stopped using drugs. Some attention is given in the report to multiple drug use.

Item No. 13

Geog. Region	Community Size	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	School Level	Usage	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana 1969	Marijuana 1972	LSD 1969	LSD 1972	Amphetamines 1969	Amphetamines 1972	Barbiturates 1969	Barbiturates 1972	Heroin 1969	Heroin 1972	Glue 1969	Glue 1972
South Atl.	Not Stated	251-item self- dmin. questionnaire	2,922	Junior High	Never Used	93.3	87.0	96.7	96.4	96.4	95.9	96.7	96.1	96.6	98.2	91.7	92.6
					Tried but Quit	2.7	5.9	0.7	1.3	1.1	2.0	0.8	1.5	0.4	0.4	5.3	5.5
					Once/Month	1.5	3.2	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.8	0.3	1.1	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.6
					Once/Week	0.6	2.6	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
					Every Day	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.1
					No Response	1.3	0.4	2.2	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.2	0.5	2.9	0.7	1.7	0.9
				Senior High	Never Used	79.7	58.7	92.1	85.7	90.3	84.7	90.8	85.4	95.1	95.5	90.7	91.1
					Tried but Quit	7.3	14.5	2.2	8.8	4.5	8.9	4.8	8.3	1.2	1.9	6.4	6.2
					Once/Month	4.3	10.9	2.1	2.8	2.1	3.4	1.9	3.5	0.2	0.6	0.6	0.5
					Once/Week	4.3	10.8	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.2	1.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3
					Every Day	2.8	4.5	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3
					No Response	1.6	0.6	2.2	1.3	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.3	2.9	1.7	1.9	1.7

(Marijuana usage was reported by specific grade and by sex for the two years.)

odman, Samuel M., Teenagers' Attitudes Toward the Use of Drugs,
Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland, August 31,

NOTES

This survey was based on a 5 percent random sample from the target population, stratified by school, grade, sex, and attendance sections. The parents of potential respondents had the opportunity to withdraw their children if they so desired. Steps were taken to assure the students that no one was selected for personal reasons, and anonymity of the individual respondents was preserved. Internal checks on the validity and credibility of the results were built into the questionnaire. A special feature of this report is the comparison between the 1972 data and the results of a 1969 survey, which was conducted in an essentially identical manner.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Year	Grade		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	Hashish M	Hashish F	Mescaline M	Mescaline F	Hallucinogens M	Hallucinogens F	Amphetamines M	Amphetamines F	Barbiturates M	Barbiturates F	Heroin or Morphine M	Heroin or Morphine F
All Junior and Senior High School Students in the Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Florida, Spring, 1971 and Spring, 1972.	South Atl.	41-item self-admin. questionnaire	17,548	1971	7	Users:	5.7	2.8	5.2	1.4	3.4	0.4	2.6	0.6	3.4	2.8	4.2	3.8	2.1	0.4
						Quitters:	4.2	0.7	1.6	0.2	1.0	1.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	4.7	3.9	2.1	0.7
						Nonusers:	89.7	95.6	92.8	98.1	95.6	98.4	94.0	96.4	94.1	94.7	91.3	92.2	95.9	98.8
					8	Users:	7.9	4.7	5.2	2.8	3.5	2.5	3.4	2.0	5.7	5.2	5.7	5.6	2.5	1.1
						Quitters:	4.2	2.9	2.2	1.5	1.8	1.3	2.8	2.1	2.8	3.6	4.9	5.1	1.6	1.0
						Nonusers:	87.2	91.5	92.1	95.0	94.5	96.2	91.7	94.7	91.3	91.2	89.0	89.2	95.6	97.8
					9	Users:	13.6	9.6	6.4	4.0	5.7	4.4	4.9	3.8	7.9	7.3	7.7	9.3	3.4	2.1
						Quitters:	5.2	5.6	3.4	4.7	3.2	1.8	5.0	3.1	4.7	8.1	6.5	10.5	3.4	1.2
						Nonusers:	80.5	83.9	90.1	90.2	91.1	93.7	89.4	91.1	87.2	84.2	85.9	79.8	93.1	96.1
					10	Users:	16.6	11.2	9.6	5.2	5.5	4.2	5.9	4.2	9.3	9.7	9.6	9.4	3.6	1.4
						Quitters:	6.5	5.7	5.4	3.9	4.4	4.6	5.0	4.8	5.7	7.1	6.4	10.9	1.6	0.9
						Nonusers:	75.4	82.2	84.0	90.0	90.2	91.3	86.5	88.1	85.0	83.1	84.0	79.4	94.5	97.5
					11	Users:	22.9	14.5	13.7	8.3	7.4	5.9	5.8	3.6	8.1	8.1	8.6	9.5	2.7	0.9
						Quitters:	10.9	7.8	6.4	4.7	8.0	5.5	9.6	5.9	9.5	9.3	10.2	11.3	1.8	1.2
						Nonusers:	65.3	77.1	79.2	86.3	84.7	89.5	81.9	88.0	82.1	82.5	81.0	78.9	95.2	97.6
					12	Users:	28.7	14.5	18.6	8.9	12.1	4.8	9.2	4.0	12.6	7.8	11.6	9.1	4.2	3.5
						Quitters:	12.8	7.6	6.1	4.0	6.9	4.0	9.6	4.0	8.5	7.2	12.8	7.6	2.6	0.9
						Nonusers:	57.6	77.0	74.7	85.3	81.1	91.3	78.9	87.9	78.3	83.9	75.0	82.6	92.6	95.3
			16,046	1972	7	Users:	9.9	3.6	6.0	1.4	2.6	0.7	3.8	1.4	4.7	3.0	6.5	5.1	2.7	0.7
						Quitters:	5.8	3.2	2.0	1.1	2.0	0.4	2.2	0.9	4.0	2.3	5.1	4.0	2.0	0.9
						Nonusers:	83.0	91.4	90.6	96.8	93.9	98.9	93.3	97.5	90.8	94.5	87.9	91.0	94.9	98.5
					8	Users:	10.8	8.8	5.8	3.5	3.3	2.3	3.2	3.3	5.1	4.4	4.2	6.7	1.9	0.8
						Quitters:	5.6	5.1	3.0	3.9	1.9	3.6	2.8	2.3	3.7	5.0	4.4	6.9	2.3	1.2
						Nonusers:	82.5	85.7	90.9	91.8	94.2	93.9	93.7	94.1	91.2	90.4	90.9	86.0	95.3	97.7
					9	Users:	24.8	17.7	11.7	8.5	7.3	6.1	6.3	5.3	10.3	11.3	10.5	12.6	3.6	1.7
						Quitters:	7.5	5.8	4.7	3.7	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.7	5.6	7.3	7.4	8.8	2.2	2.1
						Nonusers:	66.5	75.8	83.0	87.5	88.3	89.6	87.9	88.9	83.5	81.3	81.4	78.4	93.6	96.0
					10	Users:	29.7	19.6	13.4	8.8	8.5	5.2	7.3	4.8	8.5	9.0	8.9	12.7	3.2	1.4
						Quitters:	9.0	6.4	6.4	3.6	7.8	5.4	7.8	4.6	9.2	10.5	10.6	12.1	4.5	1.4
						Nonusers:	59.2	73.0	77.8	86.7	82.3	88.9	82.1	90.1	81.4	80.2	79.3	75.0	90.8	97.0
					11	Users:	32.7	18.0	15.8	10.9	9.1	5.0	6.1	4.7	7.4	10.9	7.8	13.0	2.9	2.1
						Quitters:	10.3	11.4	6.3	6.7	7.6	8.3	7.3	6.2	8.0	11.4	8.8	10.9	2.8	2.1
						Nonusers:	55.9	69.9	77.6	82.0	83.1	86.7	84.9	87.0	83.9	77.5	82.8	75.9	93.9	95.7
					12	Users:	36.6	21.6	19.6	10.1	10.6	5.0	8.5	3.5	12.6	9.5	11.8	11.9	4.2	1.8
						Quitters:	10.6	10.2	8.0	8.3	9.1	7.9	10.3	8.1	9.5	11.0	9.9	10.7	3.4	1.3
						Nonusers:	51.7	67.4	71.6	70.6	79.8	86.8	79.5	87.0	77.1	79.1	77.2	76.7	91.7	96.5

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida, Drug and Alcohol Opinionnaire and Usage Survey, Grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, Spring 1971; Spring 1972. Prepared by Research and Program Evaluation Section, Curriculum Division, Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida, May 1972.

NOTES

Presented above is a condensation of the data on drug use found i
user categories are broken down as follows:

Users: "just about every day", "about once a week", and "ab
Quitters: "... used to quite a bit" and "did once or twice"
Nonusers: "no, but I would" and "no, and I don't want to".

The figures cited above were obtained by summing the corresponding fig
Failure to add to 100 percent within sets is due to the omission of th
tion, plus possible rounding error, which together affect the results

In both years, two grades were fully surveyed, while the remainde
the ratio of approximately one out of every ten students). In 1971, g
surveyed and other grades were randomly sampled. In 1972, grades 9 an
other grades were randomly sampled. Steps were taken to preserve the
The report consists of tabular presentations of results, plus some gra
the accuracy of the responses and the comparison of the respon in t
asked to answer a question on the accuracy of their responses, to enabl
on the extent of unreliable responses. An interesting feature was the
a mythical drug ("Do you take AFC?"). However, no interpretation is g
question; they are simply presented with the other tabulations.

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Year	Grade		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	Hashish M	Hashish F	Mescaline M	Mescaline F	Hallucinogens M	Hallucinogens F	Amphetamines M	Amphetamines F	Barbiturates M	Barbiturates F	Heroin or Morphine M	Heroin or Morphine F	Opium M	Opium F	Cocaine M	Cocaine F	Inhalants M	Inhalants F
South Atl.	41-item self-admin. questionnaire	17,548	1971	7	Users:	5.7	2.8	5.2	1.4	3.4	0.4	2.6	0.6	3.4	2.8	4.2	3.8	2.1	0.4	2.9	1.2	1.9	0.4	3.6	3.6
					Quitters:	4.2	0.7	1.6	0.2	1.0	1.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	4.7	3.9	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	1.5	1.2	9.6	3.5
					Nonusers:	89.7	95.6	92.8	98.1	95.6	98.4	94.0	96.4	94.1	94.7	91.3	92.2	95.9	98.8	94.9	98.2	96.7	98.4	86.8	92.9
				8	Users:	7.9	4.7	5.2	2.8	3.5	2.5	3.4	2.0	5.7	5.2	5.7	5.6	2.5	1.1	2.8	1.3	2.7	1.2	5.9	3.8
					Quitters:	4.2	2.9	2.2	1.5	1.8	1.3	2.8	2.1	2.8	3.6	4.9	5.1	1.6	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.6	1.3	8.6	7.1
					Nonusers:	87.2	91.5	92.1	95.0	94.5	96.2	91.7	94.7	91.3	91.2	89.0	89.2	95.6	97.8	95.2	97.4	95.5	97.3	85.3	89.1
				9	Users:	13.6	9.6	6.4	4.0	5.7	4.4	4.9	3.8	7.9	7.3	7.7	9.3	3.4	2.1	4.5	3.1	4.7	2.1	6.0	5.6
					Quitters:	5.2	5.6	3.4	4.7	3.2	1.8	5.0	3.1	4.7	8.1	6.5	10.5	3.4	1.2	4.5	3.0	4.2	1.9	8.2	9.7
					Nonusers:	80.5	83.9	90.1	90.2	91.1	93.7	89.4	91.1	87.2	84.2	85.9	79.8	93.1	96.1	91.1	93.3	91.1	95.5	85.9	84.2
				10	Users:	16.6	11.2	9.6	5.2	5.5	4.2	5.9	4.2	9.3	9.7	9.6	9.4	3.6	1.4	4.2	1.9	4.9	2.0	3.7	1.5
					Quitters:	6.5	5.7	5.4	3.9	4.4	4.6	5.0	4.8	5.7	7.1	6.4	10.9	1.6	0.9	2.4	2.7	2.3	1.6	10.3	9.8
					Nonusers:	75.4	82.2	84.0	90.0	90.2	91.3	86.5	88.1	85.0	83.1	84.0	79.4	94.5	97.5	93.5	95.4	92.8	96.1	85.2	89.0
				11	Users:	22.9	14.5	13.7	8.3	7.4	5.9	5.8	3.6	8.1	8.1	8.6	9.5	2.7	0.9	3.8	1.9	3.3	1.6	3.3	1.5
					Quitters:	10.9	7.8	6.4	4.7	8.0	5.5	9.6	5.9	9.5	9.3	10.2	11.3	1.8	1.2	4.6	3.3	3.6	2.4	11.2	7.0
					Nonusers:	65.3	77.1	79.2	86.3	84.7	89.5	81.9	88.0	82.1	82.5	81.0	78.9	95.2	97.6	91.3	94.3	92.7	95.7	85.1	91.0
				12	Users:	28.7	14.5	18.6	8.9	12.1	4.8	9.2	4.0	12.6	7.8	11.6	9.1	4.2	3.5	6.5	3.3	5.5	3.0	3.2	3.8
					Quitters:	12.8	7.6	6.1	4.0	6.9	4.0	9.6	4.0	8.5	7.2	12.8	7.6	2.6	0.9	7.3	1.6	4.1	2.3	8.9	3.6
					Nonusers:	57.6	77.0	74.7	85.3	81.1	91.3	78.9	87.9	78.3	83.9	75.0	82.6	92.6	95.3	86.8	94.0	89.7	93.9	87.2	91.5
		16,046	1972	7	Users:	9.9	3.6	6.0	1.4	2.6	0.7	3.8	1.4	4.7	3.0	6.5	5.1	2.7	0.7	2.7	0.7	3.8	0.4	5.6	3.0
					Quitters:	5.8	3.2	2.0	1.1	2.0	0.4	2.2	0.9	4.0	2.3	5.1	4.0	2.0	0.9	1.3	0.7	1.1	1.2	9.8	7.7
					Nonusers:	84.0	91.4	90.6	96.8	93.9	98.9	93.3	97.5	90.8	94.5	87.9	91.0	94.9	98.5	95.6	98.6	94.2	98.0	84.2	89.3
				8	Users:	10.8	8.8	5.8	3.5	3.3	2.3	3.2	3.3	5.1	4.4	4.2	6.7	1.9	0.8	2.6	1.7	3.0	2.1	6.3	3.8
					Quitters:	5.6	5.1	3.0	3.9	1.9	3.6	2.8	2.3	3.7	5.0	4.4	6.9	2.3	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.4	11.4	10.1
					Nonusers:	82.5	85.7	90.9	91.8	94.2	93.9	93.7	94.1	91.2	90.4	90.9	86.0	95.3	97.7	95.8	96.7	95.6	96.0	81.2	85.2
				9	Users:	24.8	17.7	11.7	8.5	7.3	6.1	6.3	5.3	10.3	11.3	10.5	12.6	3.6	1.7	4.6	2.3	4.8	2.7	3.8	2.0
					Quitters:	7.5	5.8	4.7	3.7	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.7	5.6	7.3	7.4	8.8	2.2	2.1	3.1	3.1	3.9	2.6	13.7	8.9
					Nonusers:	66.5	75.8	83.0	87.5	88.3	89.6	87.9	88.9	83.5	81.3	81.4	78.4	93.6	96.0	91.8	95.4	90.8	94.3	81.4	89.1
				10	Users:	29.7	19.6	13.4	8.8	8.5	5.2	7.3	4.8	8.5	9.0	8.9	12.7	3.2	1.4	5.4	2.0	3.8	2.0	2.3	2.6
					Quitters:	9.0	6.4	6.4	3.6	7.8	5.4	7.8	4.6	9.2	10.5	10.6	12.1	4.5	1.4	3.3	1.8	4.7	1.8	11.6	7.8
					Nonusers:	59.2	73.0	77.8	86.7	82.3	88.9	82.1	90.1	81.4	80.2	79.3	75.0	90.8	97.0	89.8	95.7	89.9	95.9	85.7	89.3
				11	Users:	32.7	18.0	15.8	10.9	9.1	5.0	6.1	4.7	7.4	10.9	7.8	13.0	2.9	2.1	3.1	2.3	4.3	2.4	3.6	2.4
					Quitters:	10.3	11.4	6.3	6.7	7.6	8.3	7.3	6.2	8.0	11.4	8.8	10.9	2.8	2.1	4.3	4.5	4.9	2.8	9.0	5.2
					Nonusers:	55.9	69.9	77.6	82.0	83.1	86.7	84.9	87.0	83.9	77.5	82.8	75.9	93.9	95.7	92.2	92.6	89.6	94.3	86.3	91.8
				12	Users:	36.6	21.6	19.6	10.1	10.6	5.0	8.5	3.5	12.6	9.5	11.8	11.9	4.2	1.8	5.1	2.6	6.6	2.6	5.2	3.4
					Quitters:	10.6	10.2	8.0	8.3	9.1	7.9	10.3	8.1	9.5	11.0	9.9	10.7	3.4	1.3	4.8	5.1	4.7	2.6	10.4	8.1
					Nonusers:	51.7	67.4	71.6	70.6	79.8	86.8	79.5	87.0	77.1	79.1	77.2	76.7	91.7	96.5	88.9	94.4	87.9	94.3	83.5	88.1

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

NOTES

Presented above is a condensation of the data on drug use found in this report, in which the user categories are broken down as follows:

Users: "just about every day", "about once a week", and "about once a month";
Quitters: "... used to quite a bit" and "did once or twice"; and
Nonusers: "no, but I would" and "no, and I don't want to".

The figures cited above were obtained by summing the corresponding figures given in the report. Failure to add to 100 percent within sets is due to the omission of the "no response" classification, plus possible rounding error, which together affect the results by a fraction of one percent.

In both years, two grades were fully surveyed, while the remainder were randomly sampled (in the ratio of approximately one out of every ten students). In 1971, grades 8 and 11 were fully surveyed and other grades were randomly sampled. In 1972, grades 9 and 12 were fully surveyed and other grades were randomly sampled. Steps were taken to preserve the anonymity of the respondents. The report consists of tabular presentations of results, plus some graphs, and brief comments on the accuracy of the responses and the comparison of the responses in the two years. Students were asked to answer a question on the accuracy of their responses, to enable some judgment to be made on the extent of unreliable responses. An interesting feature was the inclusion of a question on a mythical drug ("Do you take AFC?"). However, no interpretation is given of the results of this question; they are simply presented with the other tabulations.

Board, Jacksonville, Florida, Drug and Alcohol Opinionnaire and 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, Spring 1971; Spring 1972. Prepared by Evaluation Section, Curriculum Division, Duval County School Florida, May 1972.

Item No. 15

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents			Percentage of Respondents										
						Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Mesca-line	Psilo-cybin	Speed	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Opium	Cocaine	Glue Sniffing
Students, grades 7 through 12, in the eight local school districts of Shiawassee County, Michigan January 1972.	East North Central	17-item self-admin. questionnaire	7,432	Experimentation												
				Males:	Age 12	4	1	0.5	0.3	0.3	1	4	0.5	0.5	1	12
					13	7	2	2	2	1	3	6	0.7	0.7	2	13
					14	12	5	3	3	1	5	6	0.7	2	2	13
					15	23	10	7	7	3	9	12	2	3	4	13
					16	34	18	9	13	5	15	16	3	7	6	15
					17	37	21	12	15	6	18	17	4	9	7	13
					18	42	26	14	17	8	17	20	6	11	10	13
					Total	22	11	6	8	3	10	11	2	4	4	13
				Females:	Age 12	2	0.9	0.4	0.9	0.4	2	3	0.4	0.4	1	10
					13	6	2	2	1	0.7	5	5	0.5	0.8	1	11
					14	13	4	4	4	2	9	10	1	2	3	11
					15	18	7	5	7	2	13	13	2	3	3	13
					16	28	15	9	12	4	20	21	2	5	5	10
					17	26	15	8	11	4	16	18	2	5	4	7
					18	24	13	8	12	7	18	14	4	9	7	6
					Total	16	8	5	6	2	11	12	1	3	3	10
				Use												
				Males:	Age 12	1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	1	0	0.5	0.5	4
					13	4	1	0.2	1	0.7	1	2	0.2	0.3	0.7	3
					14	7	3	2	2	0.6	2	3	0.3	0.7	0.7	3
					15	16	7	4	4	2	5	6	0.8	1	1	5
					16	27	13	7	9	4	9	10	1	4	2	6
					17	27	14	8	10	3	13	13	2	5	5	5
					18	32	18	12	12	6	11	14	3	8	7	5
					Total	16	7	5	5	2	6	6	0.9	2	2	5
				Females:	Age 12	1	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.7	1	0.2	0.4	0.7	3
					13	3	0.8	0.2	1	0.3	2	2	0.3	0.5	0.7	3
					14	8	3	2	1	0.4	4	5	0.9	0.9	1	4
					15	13	3	4	3	1	9	8	0.9	1	1	6
					16	21	10	7	8	2	14	14	1	3	3	3
					17	20	12	6	8	3	11	13	0.4	4	2	3
					18	18	11	3	8	4	9	10	1	4	3	1
					Total	11	5	3	4	1	7	8	0.7	2	2	4

REFERENCE

Mobley, Jack and Harrison, James A., Drug and Alcohol Abuse in Rural Mid-Michigan. Commission on Alcohol and Drug Education (C.A.D.E.) of Shiawassee County, Michigan, Shiawassee County Intermediate School District, Corunna, Michigan 48817, March 17, 1972.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data on illegal drugs found in this report. "Experimentation" refers to the use of the indicated drugs once, occasionally, or frequently. "Use" refers to the last two of these categories, viz., occasionally or frequently.

The questionnaires were administered to 7,432 students, constituting 88 percent of the grade 7-12 population of the county. Since absenteeism on any given day will run about 12 percent, the 88 percent participation is all that could reasonably be expected on any day of the school year. The survey was not announced in advance, and anonymity of the respondents was assured.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Age	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	LSD M	LSD F	Hallucinogens M	Hallucinogens F	Amphetamines M	Amphetamines F	Barbiturates M	Barbiturates F	Tranquilizers M	Tranquilizers F	Opia M
Students in grades 7-12 in New Hampshire schools. 1972	New England	Question-naire	8,846	12	4.0	1.9	1.0	0.2	5.6	2.1	2.2	0.9	2.2	2.1	1.9	0.7	1.2
				13-14	12.2	13.0	3.3	3.8	7.1	7.3	4.3	6.1	6.2	9.1	3.1	4.3	2.3
				15-16	30.0	27.6	9.3	7.5	16.0	12.4	11.0	11.5	9.5	13.1	5.7	7.1	6.0
				17-18	41.0	32.8	14.2	8.0	20.9	12.6	14.4	14.5	11.9	12.6	6.8	8.4	9.2
				19+	38.5	7.1	19.2	7.1	32.7	14.3	21.2	7.1	19.2	0.0	15.4	7.1	13.4
				Total	25.2	21.7	8.1	5.8	13.8	9.9	9.2	9.5	8.6	10.7	5.0	5.9	5.4

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

New Hampshire, State of, "Governor's Committee on Drug Abuse Data Collection." Mimeo, 14 p., State of New Hampshire Department of Health and Welfare, September 14, 1972.

NOTES

The figures presented above pertain to users (within the previous six months) of th
They have been inferred, as percentages of the numbers of respondents of each sex in eac
the numbers given in Table 4 in this report. The total numbers of respondents of each a
group are given in Chart 1 in the report. The schools (56) were randomly selected and a
random sampling of students by grade was designated by the school administrator. No det
questionnaire or its administration are given.

In addition to the school survey, the report also describes an investigation of a p
drug users.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Grade	Use in Last Year (Number of times)	Year	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	Hallucinogens LSD M	Hallucinogens LSD F	Hallucinogens Other M	Hallucinogens Other F	Amphet-amines M	Amphet-amines F	B u M
All students in Grades 10-12 at Parkway West Senior High School in Ballwin, Missouri. 1971 and 1972	West North Central	Small City (11,000)	12-item self-admin. questionnaire answered on computer card.	1519 in 1971 1570 in 1972	10	1-2	1971	10.7	8.1	3.8	4.1	3.5	6.7	5.9	6.2	3
							1972	7.1	5.5	4.5	7.0	7.8	8.4	5.9	3.3	4
						3-9	1971	3.2	5.3	1.9	1.4	3.9	2.4	2.3	2.9	1
							1972	5.2	4.0	2.6	1.9	3.6	5.9	2.9	4.8	1
						10+	1971	12.7	9.6	3.4	5.5	3.5	4.3	3.4	3.3	1
							1972	18.3	14.3	3.6	2.2	5.5	2.5	1.5	1.1	2
					11	1-2	1971	7.0	6.0	2.4	4.9	3.4	4.9	6.8	6.5	5
							1972	6.8	8.6	5.0	2.7	5.4	6.6	4.3	6.6	3
						3-9	1971	3.7	1.6	4.8	1.2	5.9	2.0	2.5	3.3	1
							1972	5.6	5.8	3.9	4.6	4.5	5.0	4.3	2.3	3
						10+	1971	19.9	12.9	4.8	2.4	5.1	3.6	4.2	1.2	1
							1972	20.5	14.8	3.6	2.3	5.0	5.0	4.6	2.3	1
					12	1-2	1971	9.7	6.5	3.9	3.4	4.5	5.0	7.1	6.8	6
							1972	9.0	8.2	7.0	4.1	10.3	8.2	8.2	5.6	4
						3-9	1971	7.9	7.5	5.7	1.4	6.3	2.5	3.1	2.5	0
							1972	7.0	4.6	4.9	1.8	4.9	0.9	3.3	2.8	1
						10+	1971	18.4	15.1	7.9	1.9	9.4	2.0	5.2	1.0	4
							1972	26.0	15.6	5.7	1.8	3.3	3.2	3.3	2.3	2

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Survey Results furnished by Mr. Dan Natale, Assistant Principal, Parkway West Senior High School, Ballwin, Missouri 63011.

NOTES

The procedure used in this survey was to ask the students during a
to respond to a 12-item questionnaire by recording their answers on an
of individual respondents was preserved. Except for absentees on the
were received from all members of the target population.

Item No. 16

ion d	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Age	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	LSD M	LSD F	Hallucinogens M	Hallucinogens F	Amphetamines M	Amphetamines F	Barbiturates M	Barbiturates F	Tranquilizers M	Tranquilizers F	Opiates M	Opiates F	Inhalants M	Inhalants F
s	New	Question-	8,846	12	4.0	1.9	1.0	0.2	5.6	2.1	2.2	0.9	2.2	2.1	1.9	0.7	1.2	0.5	4.0	2.6
es	England	naire		13-14	12.2	13.0	3.3	3.8	7.1	7.3	4.3	6.1	6.2	9.1	3.1	4.3	2.3	2.5	4.5	5.0
				15-16	30.0	27.6	9.3	7.5	16.0	12.4	11.0	11.5	9.5	13.1	5.7	7.1	6.0	3.7	5.8	4.1
				17-18	41.0	32.8	14.2	8.0	20.9	12.6	14.4	14.5	11.9	12.6	6.8	8.4	9.2	4.4	4.1	2.8
re				19+	38.5	7.1	19.2	7.1	23.7	14.3	21.2	7.1	19.2	0.0	15.4	7.1	13.4	14.3	15.4	0.0
.				Total	25.2	21.7	8.1	5.8	13.8	9.9	9.2	9.5	8.6	10.7	5.0	5.9	5.4	3.2	5.0	3.9

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

NCE

pshire, State of, "Governor's
tee on Drug Abuse Data Collection."
14 p., State of New Hampshire
ment of Health and Welfare,
ber 14, 1972.

NOTES

The figures presented above pertain to users (within the previous six months) of the indicated drugs. They have been inferred, as percentages of the numbers of respondents of each sex in each age group, from the numbers given in Table 4 in this report. The total numbers of respondents of each sex in each age group are given in Chart 1 in the report. The schools (56) were randomly selected and a proportionate random sampling of students by grade was designated by the school administrator. No details on the questionnaire or its administration are given.

In addition to the school survey, the report also describes an investigation of a population of 1565 drug users.

Item No. 17

eog. egion	Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Grade	Use in Last Year (Number of times)	Year	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	Hallucinogens LSD M	Hallucinogens LSD F	Hallucinogens Other M	Hallucinogens Other F	Amphet-amines M	Amphet-amines F	Barbit-urates M	Barbit-urates F	Opiates M	Opiates F	Inhalants M	Inhalants F
est	Small City	12-item	1519 in 1971	10	1-2	1971	10.7	8.1	3.8	4.1	3.5	6.7	5.9	6.2	3.1	2.4	2.8	3.4	4.8	5.3
orth	(11,000)	self-admin.	1570 in 1972			1972	7.1	5.5	4.5	7.0	7.8	8.4	5.9	3.3	4.9	3.3	6.2	7.0	2.9	9.2
entral		questionnaire			3-9	1971	3.2	5.3	1.9	1.4	3.9	2.4	2.3	2.9	1.9	1.5	2.0	1.5	3.7	2.1
		answered on				1972	5.2	4.0	2.6	1.9	3.6	5.9	2.9	4.8	1.3	4.4	0.9	1.4	2.2	0.3
		computer			10+	1971	12.7	9.6	3.4	5.5	3.5	4.3	3.4	3.3	1.6	1.9	3.2	0.9	2.0	2.6
		card.				1972	18.3	14.3	3.6	2.2	5.5	2.5	1.5	1.1	2.6	1.1	1.3	0.3	1.3	0.3
				11	1-2	1971	7.0	6.0	2.4	4.9	3.4	4.9	6.8	6.5	5.4	4.0	4.8	4.4	5.1	5.0
						1972	6.8	8.6	5.0	2.7	5.4	6.6	4.3	6.6	3.2	5.4	4.6	4.3	2.8	5.0
					3-9	1971	3.7	1.6	4.8	1.2	5.9	2.0	2.5	3.3	1.8	1.2	2.2	0.0	2.3	2.9
						1972	5.6	5.8	3.9	4.6	4.5	5.0	4.3	2.3	3.2	1.3	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.0
					10+	1971	19.9	12.9	4.8	2.4	5.1	3.6	4.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3	0.0	1.7	0.0
						1972	20.5	14.8	3.6	2.3	5.0	5.0	4.6	2.3	1.9	1.2	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.0
				12	1-2	1971	9.7	6.5	3.9	3.4	4.5	5.0	7.1	6.8	6.4	3.1	3.6	3.0	4.0	2.0
						1972	9.0	8.2	7.0	4.1	10.3	8.2	8.2	5.6	4.9	4.1	4.1	1.4	5.3	4.1
					3-9	1971	7.9	7.5	5.7	1.4	6.3	2.5	3.1	2.5	0.0	1.0	1.8	1.5	1.3	0.5
						1972	7.0	4.6	4.9	1.8	4.9	0.9	3.3	2.8	3.6	1.4	3.3	0.9	1.2	0.9
					10+	1971	18.4	15.1	7.9	1.9	9.4	2.0	5.2	1.0	4.0	1.0	1.5	1.8	1.8	0.0
						1972	26.0	15.6	5.7	1.8	3.3	3.2	3.3	2.3	2.4	1.4	1.7	1.4	0.8	0.4

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

y Mr. Dan Natale, Assistant Principal, Parkway West
n, Missouri 63011.

NOTES

The procedure used in this survey was to ask the students during a selected home-base period to respond to a 12-item questionnaire by recording their answers on an IBM answer card. Anonymity of individual respondents was preserved. Except for absentees on the day of the survey, responses were received from all members of the target population.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents Using: Marijuana or THC	Hashish	LSD	MDA, etc.	Mescaline or Peyote	Amphetamines	Barbiturates
Students in grades 6 through 12 in all 51 schools of the Anchorage Borough School District and in the 10 schools located at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson Army Base, Anchorage Alaska. November 17, 1971.	Pacific	18-item self-admin. questionnaire	15,634	Use at Least Once							
				Grade 6	3.4	1.0	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.4	1.0
				7	8.7	3.3	2.2	1.5	1.9	3.3	2.3
				8	21.2	10.4	7.1	3.7	7.5	11.6	7.5
				9	29.4	17.2	12.4	6.4	13.7	16.6	13.0
				10	39.5	23.8	17.1	10.9	18.4	21.4	15.5
				11	45.9	30.6	21.8	14.0	24.5	25.1	19.2
				12	45.7	32.0	18.7	13.4	22.1	25.0	17.5
				Total	24.0	14.1	9.7	5.9	10.6	12.8	9.4
				Use Ten or More Times							
				Grade 6	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
				7	3.5	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.6
				8	9.9	3.6	2.3	1.0	2.6	3.4	2.1
				9	17.7	8.0	4.8	2.0	5.5	6.4	4.5
				10	25.4	12.1	8.4	3.6	8.7	9.3	5.9
				11	30.4	16.9	12.2	4.1	12.4	11.9	7.2
				12	31.2	18.6	10.0	5.2	10.5	11.8	6.7
				Total	14.1	6.8	4.4	1.9	4.7	5.2	3.2
				Use Once or More This Week							
				Grade 6	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1
				7	1.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.3
				8	5.8	1.9	1.0	0.3	1.0	1.1	0.8
				9	12.0	3.3	1.9	0.7	1.5	3.1	1.5
				10	15.5	4.4	3.2	1.1	3.0	3.6	1.8
				11	21.0	6.2	3.7	1.4	3.2	3.9	1.3
				12	20.5	7.8	3.2	1.3	2.1	4.0	1.1
				Total	9.0	2.8	1.6	0.6	1.4	2.0	0.9
				Use Four or More Times This Week							
				Grade 6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
				7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2
				8	1.9	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1
				9	4.5	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.3
				10	6.4	1.3	0.7	0.1	0.6	1.0	0.4
				11	8.1	1.8	0.6	0.2	0.6	1.1	0.4
				12	9.3	2.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.6
				Total	3.6	0.9	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.2

REFERENCE

Greater Anchorage Borough Health Department, Drug Use as Reported by 15,634 Anchorage, Alaska Students in Grades Six Through Twelve--1971. Mimeo, 33 p., Greater Anchorage Borough Health Department, Anchorage, Alaska, 1971.

NOTES

The above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in Tables 3 through 6
tion "MDA, etc." denotes MDA, Psilocybin, STP, DMT, DET; "hard narcotics" denotes h
"other drugs" refers to any drug or drugs not listed in the questionnaire. Tables
figures for the use of Darvon, methadone, non-prescription stimulants, non-prescrip
prescription tranquilizers (as well as alcoholic beverages and tobacco). Table 7
numbers and percentages of students using a drug at least once and ten or more time
use.

The questionnaire was administered to the students present in school on the d
were taken to maximize the validity of the responses and to ensure the anonymity o
of 17,189 completed questionnaires were received from an estimated 97.4 percent of
present on that day. After screening, 15,634 questionnaires were considered usabl
89 percent of all students present, and about 81 percent of all students enrolled
surveyed.

Item No. 18

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana or THC	Hashish	LSD	MDA, etc.	Mescaline or Peyote	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Hard Narcotics	Solvents	Other Drugs
Pacific	18-item self-admin. questionnaire	15,634	Use At Least Once											
			Grade 6	3.4	1.0	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.4	1.0	2.5	0.5	10.0	1.8
			7	8.7	3.3	2.2	1.5	1.9	3.3	2.3	2.3	1.0	11.6	2.4
			8	21.2	10.4	7.1	3.7	7.5	11.6	7.5	3.9	2.6	21.3	4.5
			9	29.4	17.2	12.4	6.4	13.7	16.6	13.0	6.2	3.7	21.2	5.3
			10	39.5	23.8	17.1	10.9	18.4	21.4	15.5	7.9	6.6	20.0	5.1
			11	45.9	30.6	21.8	14.0	24.5	25.1	19.2	9.3	8.2	19.4	5.4
			12	45.7	32.0	18.7	13.4	22.1	25.0	17.5	9.5	9.1	14.5	5.0
			Total	24.0	14.1	9.7	5.9	10.6	12.8	9.4	5.3	3.8	16.6	4.0
			Use Ten or More Times											
			Grade 6	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.1	2.7	0.4
			7	3.5	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.3	3.8	0.8
			8	9.9	3.6	2.3	1.0	2.6	3.4	2.1	0.8	0.7	7.7	2.1
			9	17.7	8.0	4.8	2.0	5.5	6.4	4.5	1.4	0.9	8.0	2.5
			10	25.4	12.1	8.4	3.6	8.7	9.3	5.9	2.4	1.9	6.7	2.9
			11	30.4	16.9	12.2	4.1	12.4	11.9	7.2	2.1	1.6	5.5	2.2
			12	31.2	18.6	10.0	5.2	10.5	11.8	6.7	2.4	2.8	4.2	1.7
			Total	14.1	6.8	4.4	1.9	4.7	5.2	3.2	1.3	1.0	5.5	1.7
			Use Once or More This Week											
			Grade 6	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.0	0.1
			7	1.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.2	1.2	0.3
			8	5.8	1.9	1.0	0.3	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.3	2.4	0.5
			9	12.0	3.3	1.9	0.7	1.5	3.1	1.5	0.4	0.4	2.1	0.8
			10	15.5	4.4	3.2	1.1	3.0	3.6	1.8	1.0	0.5	1.3	0.9
			11	21.0	6.2	3.7	1.4	3.2	3.9	1.3	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.0
			12	20.5	7.8	3.2	1.3	2.1	4.0	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.6
			Total	9.0	2.8	1.6	0.6	1.4	2.0	0.9	0.6	0.4	1.5	0.6
			Use Four or More Times This Week											
			Grade 6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.1
			7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.3
			8	1.9	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.5
			9	4.5	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.8
			10	6.4	1.3	0.7	0.1	0.6	1.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.9
			11	8.1	1.8	0.6	0.2	0.6	1.1	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.6	1.0
			12	9.3	2.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.6
			Total	3.6	0.9	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.6

NOTES

The above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in Tables 3 through 6 in this report. The notation "MDA, etc." denotes MDA, Psilocybin, STP, DMT, DET; "hard narcotics" denotes heroin, morphine or opium; "other drugs" refers to any drug or drugs not listed in the questionnaire. Tables 3 through 6 also give figures for the use of Darvon, methadone, non-prescription stimulants, non-prescription tranquilizers, and prescription tranquilizers (as well as alcoholic beverages and tobacco). Table 7 in the report gives the numbers and percentages of students using a drug at least once and ten or more times who indicated continuing use.

The questionnaire was administered to the students present in school on the day of the survey. Steps were taken to maximize the validity of the responses and to ensure the anonymity of the respondents. A total of 17,189 completed questionnaires were received from an estimated 97.4 percent of the students listed as present on that day. After screening, 15,6[illegible] questionnaires were considered usable. This represents about 89 percent of all students present, and about [illegible]1 percent of all students enrolled in the seven grade levels surveyed.

CE

Anchorage Borough Health
nt, Drug Use as Reported
4 Anchorage, Alaska
in Grades Six Through
-1971. Mimeo, 33 p.,
Anchorage Borough Health
nt, Anchorage, Alaska,

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Year		Percentage of Respondents									
							Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Stimulants		Barbiturates		Opiates / Cocaine	
							M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Students in 55 (1970) and 56 (1971) secondary schools (Grades 7-12) in the Houston Independent School District, Texas. December 1970 December 1971	West South Central	City (1,678,000)	88-item self-admin. questionnaire with a separate answer sheet	5,819	1971	Ever Used:										
						Gr. 7	7.6	6.3	3.5	3.8	6.5	4.6	5.5	3.0	3.0	1.
						Gr. 8	19.7	12.3	8.2	6.6	14.5	11.8	11.5	9.5	6.9	4.
						Gr. 9	33.8	22.4	12.2	9.2	22.4	18.5	17.9	15.0	9.5	7.
						Gr. 10	37.6	25.6	15.7	12.7	24.4	21.3	19.3	19.3	13.0	7.
						Gr. 11	47.6	29.2	20.9	14.8	27.2	20.9	20.1	17.4	13.1	9.
						Gr. 12	50.3	33.9	25.0	13.6	29.4	24.4	23.6	21.4	17.5	7.
						Overall	25.1		11.2		17.6		14.3		8.0	
						Used in past 6 months:										
						Gr. 7	6.5	5.2	1.9	1.7	4.8	3.3	4.1	2.6	2.0	1.
						Gr. 8	17.4	10.9	7.0	6.1	11.4	9.3	9.8	7.2	6.0	4.
						Gr. 9	28.9	20.2	10.3	8.0	17.6	14.2	13.9	13.0	7.2	4.
						Gr. 10	32.0	23.4	12.4	10.4	19.2	19.0	15.3	15.9	10.2	6.
						Gr. 11	40.2	25.5	16.1	12.2	23.5	17.7	16.5	11.9	9.8	8.
						Gr. 12	41.8	29.6	20.3	9.6	23.9	20.3	17.6	18.2	12.2	5.
						Overall	21.7		9.0		14.1		11.4		6.1	
						Used in past 7 days:										
						Gr. 7	4.1	1.9	1.5	0.5	2.6	1.6	3.1	1.7	1.1	0.
						Gr. 8	11.0	6.0	2.3	3.1	6.4	5.7	6.2	4.1	3.5	2.
						Gr. 9	16.7	11.8	3.1	2.8	8.7	8.2	5.1	5.7	3.5	2.
						Gr. 10	23.4	13.7	5.1	4.6	9.1	9.6	9.1	7.3	5.1	3.
						Gr. 11	25.2	17.4	3.2	5.2	9.2	8.1	7.3	6.2	3.5	3.
						Gr. 12	30.9	16.4	7.3	1.2	11.2	7.1	0.9	5.7	4.0	1.
						Overall	13.6		3.2		6.9		5.5		2.7	
				5,908	1970	Ever Used:										
						Gr. 7	7.9	5.5	2.4	2.7	6.7	6.1	5.1	3.7	3.5	1.
						Gr. 8	15.3	10.3	6.5	3.7	11.6	7.7	7.0	4.6	3.8	2.
						Gr. 9	23.1	16.3	10.3	6.8	16.7	13.2	11.7	8.4	6.2	2.
						Gr. 10	27.4	23.6	14.3	12.7	18.8	19.0	12.1	14.0	6.0	4.
						Gr. 11	45.4	20.6	22.5	9.5	28.3	17.2	18.0	12.6	10.1	4.
						Gr. 12	48.4	25.9	19.3	6.9	26.1	14.6	18.5	8.2	11.6	3.
						Overall	22.2		9.8		15.7		10.6		5.1	
						Comparison of "Overall" data Used in past 6 months:										
						1971	21.7		9.0		14.1		11.4		6.1	
						1970	19.5		7.9		13.0		8.8		4.4	
						Used in past 7 days:										
						1971	13.6		3.2		6.9		5.5		2.7	
						1970	11.7		3.4		6.0		3.7		2.0	

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCES

[1] Hays, J. Ray, "The Incidence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston", St. Joseph Hospital Medical Surgical Journal, Vol. 6, Nos. 1&2, pp. 52-59, Spring 1971.

[2] Hays, J. Ray, "The Incidence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston, 1971". St. Joseph Hospital Medical Surgical Journal, Vol. 7, pp. 146-152, 1972.

NOTES

Compiled above are the quantitative data on drug use found in [2], plus category found in [1]. Data on the other two categories are given in [1], because of space limitations. However, the comparison of "Overall" data fo an indication of the trends which were observed. An important feature of t availability of baseline data (for 1970), with which the 1971 data (and dat available) can be compared. Procedures used were the same in the two years sample represented approximately six percent of the secondary students enro Independent School District (HISD). The author indicates that these sample approximations to the secondary school student population of HISD, the corr demographic variables being slightly closer in the 1971 sample. Adequate p ensure the anonymity of both the individual students and the schools. Othe administering the survey lend credibility to the validity of the results ob

g. ion	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Year		Percentage of Respondents											
						Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Stimulants		Barbiturate		Opiates or Cocaine		Cough Syrup		Solvents	
						M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
t th tral	City (1,678,000)	88-item self-admin. questionnaire with a separate answer sheet	5,819	1971	Ever Used:														
					Gr. 7	7.6	6.1	3.5	3.8	6.5	4.6	5.5	3.0	3.0	1.9	13.6	12.5	9.6	5.7
					Gr. 8	19.7	12.3	8.2	6.6	14.5	11.8	11.5	9.5	6.9	4.9	16.4	12.3	17.7	8.1
					Gr. 9	33.8	22.4	12.2	9.2	22.4	18.5	17.9	15.0	9.3	7.0	15.2	12.2	18.2	10.9
					Gr. 10	37.6	25.6	15.7	12.7	24.4	21.3	19.3	19.3	13.0	7.4	17.2	15.7	13.9	13.2
					Gr. 11	47.6	29.2	20.9	14.8	27.2	20.9	20.1	17.4	13.1	9.9	17.1	11.4	17.6	8.8
					Gr. 12	50.3	33.9	25.0	13.6	29.4	24.4	23.6	21.4	17.5	7.2	20.4	8.3	16.1	6.3
					Overall	25.1		11.2		17.6		14.3		8.0		14.2		12.0	
					Used in past 6 months:														
					Gr. 7	6.5	5.2	1.9	1.7	4.8	3.3	4.1	2.6	2.0	1.2	7.4	7.0	4.6	3.3
					Gr. 8	17.4	10.9	7.0	6.1	11.4	9.3	9.8	7.2	6.0	4.7	9.2	8.7	10.3	4.7
					Gr. 9	28.9	20.2	10.3	8.0	17.6	14.2	13.9	13.0	7.2	4.8	11.2	7.5	11.2	7.6
					Gr. 10	32.0	23.4	12.4	10.4	19.2	19.0	15.3	15.9	10.2	6.1	8.8	7.8	8.3	6.1
					Gr. 11	40.2	25.5	16.1	12.2	23.5	17.7	16.5	11.9	9.8	8.3	9.8	6.8	9.0	3.9
					Gr. 12	41.8	29.6	20.3	9.6	23.9	20.3	17.6	18.2	12.2	5.1	10.0	3.9	6.7	1.8
					Overall	21.7		9.0		14.1		11.4		6.1		8.3		6.3	
					Used in past 7 days:														
					Gr. 7	4.1	1.9	1.5	0.5	2.6	1.6	3.1	1.7	1.1	0.5	2.4	3.5	2.8	1.6
					Gr. 8	11.0	6.0	2.3	3.1	6.4	5.7	6.2	4.1	3.5	2.4	5.0	4.7	6.4	2.1
					Gr. 9	16.7	11.8	3.1	2.8	8.7	8.2	5.1	5.7	3.5	2.3	3.7	4.3	3.7	2.4
					Gr. 10	23.4	13.7	5.1	4.6	9.1	9.6	9.1	7.3	5.1	3.5	4.2	2.5	4.0	2.8
					Gr. 11	25.2	17.4	3.2	5.2	9.2	8.1	7.3	6.2	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.1	2.9	1.8
					Gr. 12	30.9	16.4	7.3	1.2	11.2	7.1	0.9	5.7	4.0	1.2	4.5	1.2	1.2	0.6
					Overall	13.6		3.2		6.9		5.5		2.7		3.6		2.8	
			5,908	1970	Ever Used:														
					Gr. 7	7.9	5.5	2.4	2.7	6.7	6.1	5.1	3.7	3.5	1.5	11.5	15.9	7.9	4.9
					Gr. 8	15.3	10.3	6.5	3.7	11.6	7.7	7.0	4.6	3.8	2.8	15.2	14.8	12.9	6.7
					Gr. 9	23.1	16.3	10.3	6.8	16.7	13.2	11.7	8.4	6.2	2.5	17.4	12.2	15.4	9.2
					Gr. 10	27.4	23.6	14.3	12.7	18.8	19.0	12.1	14.0	6.0	4.9	11.6	11.9	14.0	11.3
					Gr. 11	45.4	20.6	22.5	9.5	28.3	17.2	18.0	12.6	10.1	4.9	21.9	13.1	20.2	8.3
					Gr. 12	48.4	25.9	19.3	6.9	26.1	14.6	18.5	8.2	11.6	3.4	19.3	5.8	18.6	5.6
					Overall	22.2		9.8		15.7		10.6		5.1		14.6		11.7	
					Comparison of "Overall" data Used in past 6 months:														
					1971	21.7		9.0		14.1		11.4		6.1		8.3		6.3	
					1970	19.5		7.9		13.0		8.8		4.4		8.6		5.7	
					Used in past 7 days:														
					1971	13.6		3.2		6.9		5.5		2.7		3.6		2.8	
					1970	11.7		3.4		6.0		3.7		2.0		3.2		2.2	

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

NOTES

Compiled above are the quantitative data on drug use found in [2], plus data on the "Ever Used" category found in [1]. Data on the other two categories are given in [1], but are omitted above because of space limitations. However, the comparison of "Overall" data for the two years provides an indication of the trends which were observed. An important feature of these two papers is the availability of baseline data (for 1970), with which the 1971 data (and data for future years, when available) can be compared. Procedures used were the same in the two years, and in each case the sample represented approximately six percent of the secondary students enrolled in the Houston Independent School District (HISD). The author indicates that these samples provided adequate approximations to the secondary school student population of HISD, the correspondence in terms of demographic variables being slightly closer in the 1971 sample. Adequate precautions were taken to ensure the anonymity of both the individual students and the schools. Other precautions taken in administering the survey lend credibility to the validity of the results obtained.

idence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston". dical Surgical Journal, Vol. 6, Nos. 1&2, pp. 52-59, Spring 1971.

idence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston, pital Medical Surgical Journal, Vol. 7, pp. 146-152, 1972.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Frequency of use
High School Students (Grades 9-12) in South Carolina Fall 1971	South Atl.	Not identified	65-item self-admin. questionnaire	10,258*	1-2 times per day 1-2 times per week 1-2 times per month 1-2 times per year 1-2 times ever Quit Never used

* Varies slightly by drug category due to rejects. The maximum number of rejects in any category was 65, less than 2/3 of 1 percent of the sample.

	Percentage of Respondents				
Marijuana	Hallucinogens (incl. LSD)	Stimulants	Depressants	Heroin or Morphine	C
1.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.4	
3.1	0.9	1.2	0.7	0.5	
3.0	1.9	1.9	1.4	0.6	
1.1	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.4	
3.6	1.6	2.4	2.2	1.0	
1.9	1.0	1.3	1.1	0.6	
85.3	93.5	91.3	93.2	96.3	

(In the report these data are broken down by urban and rural)

REFERENCE

Milne, L. D. and Vincent, Murray L., Survey of Drug Use Among South Carolina High School Students, Fall 1971. Mimeo, 33 p., Report of a Survey Funded by South Carolina Commission of Narcotics and Controlled Substances, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.

NOTES

This survey embodies the following statistical aspects of good surv

1. The schools surveyed were selected by random sampling, although detail on the randomization procedure which was actually used.
2. The questionnaire was carefully designed, pre-tested on a group be included in the actual survey, and revised on the basis of p
3. The testing session in each school was not announced in advance bability that absenteeism on the given day is related to the su However, it does not guard against the possibility that chronic to drug abuse.
4. All students in each school completed the survey at the same ti any opportunity for one group to "prepare" others and thus poss
5. Anonymity of individual students (and schools insofar as the fi was guaranteed.
6. Standardized procedures were used in the administration of the
7. Internal validity checks were built into the questionnaire.

On the negative side, the fact that responses judged to be "uncooperati introduce an element of non-response bias.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in the junior and senior high schools in the public school system of Virginia Planning District 15 Spring and Fall 1971	South Atlantic	90-item multiple-choice anonymous questionnaire	2,998

	Percentage of Respondents						
	Mari-juana	Hallu-cinogens	Depressants Strong	Depressants Other	Stimulants Strong	Stimulants Other	Narcotics
Ever Used	14	5	4	7	7	5	2
Current Use	7	2	4		5		
Used 5 or more Times							

REFERENCE

Council on Drug Abuse Control, Regional Drug Attitude and Abuse Pattern Survey Summary Report. Council on Drug Abuse Control, Richmond Regional Planning District Commission, Suite 810, 7th and Franklin Building, 701 E. Franklin Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219, no date.

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to the [illegible]al region covered by this surv includes the City of Richmond and the Count[illegible] of Charles City, Chesterfield, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, and Powhatan. The corresponding data for each of school districts are given in the report. Hallucinogens include LSD, PCP, ST etc.; strong depressants include "Reds, Yellows, Rainbows, Blues, etc."; stro incluce "Bennies, Co-pilots, Speed, Pep pills, etc."

The survey was conducted in the spring of 1971 in Richmond, Chesterfield in the fall of 1971 in the other counties. A 10 percent random sample of the grades 8 through 12 was surveyed in each school. The questionnaire included drug attitudes and opinions, and 8 questions of a demographic nature. The br study was to improve the quality of drug education in the region.

Item No. 20

Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Frequency of use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens (incl. LSD)	Stimulants	Depressants	Heroin or Morphine	Cocaine	Solvents
Not identified	65-item self-admin. questionnaire	10,258*	1-2 times per day	1.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5
			1-2 times per week	3.1	0.9	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.0
			1-2 times per month	3.0	1.9	1.9	1.4	0.6	0.9	1.1
			1-2 times per year	1.1	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.4	0.6	1.3
			1-2 times ever	3.6	1.6	2.4	2.2	1.0	1.2	3.5
			Quit	1.9	1.0	1.3	1.1	0.6	0.7	2.9
			Never used	85.3	93.5	91.3	93.2	96.3	94.9	90.4

slightly by drug category due to
s. The maximum number of rejects
category was 65, less than 2/3 of
ent of the sample.

(In the report these data are broken down by urban and rural)

L., Survey of Drug Use Among South Carolina High School Students,
of a Survey Funded by South Carolina Commission of Narcotics
rsity of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.

NOTES

This survey embodies the following statistical aspects of good survey design.

1. The schools surveyed were selected by random sampling, although the report provides little detail on the randomization procedure which was actually used.
2. The questionnaire was carefully designed, pre-tested on a group of students not to be included in the actual survey, and revised on the basis of pre-test findings.
3. The testing session in each school was not announced in advance. This reduces the probability that absenteeism on the given day is related to the subject of the survey. However, it does not guard against the possibility that chronic absenteeism is related to drug abuse.
4. All students in each school completed the survey at the same time, thus precluding any opportunity for one group to "prepare" others and thus possibly bias the results.
5. Anonymity of individual students (and schools insofar as the final report is concerned) was guaranteed.
6. Standardized procedures were used in the administration of the survey in each school.
7. Internal validity checks were built into the questionnaire.

On the negative side, the fact that responses judged to be "uncooperative" were discarded does introduce an element of non-response bias.

Item No. 21

pulation Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Mari-juana	Hallu-cinogens	Depressants Strong	Depressants Other	Stimulants Strong	Stimulants Other	Narcotics	Glue Sniffing
udents in the nior and senior gh schools in the blic school system Virginia anning District 15 ring and Fall 1971	South Atlantic	90-item multiple-choice anonymous questionnaire	2,998	Ever Used	14	5	4	7	7	5	2	7
				Current Use	7	2		4		5		
				Used 5 or more Times								4

FERENCE

uncil on Drug Abuse Control, Regional Drug Attitude
d Abuse Pattern Survey Summary Report. Council on
ug Abuse Control, Richmond Regional Planning District
mmission, Suite 810, 7th and Franklin Building, 701
Franklin Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219, no date.

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to the total region covered by this survey, which includes the City of Richmond and the Counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, and Powhatan. The corresponding data for each of the eight school districts are given in the report. Hallucinogens include LSD, PCP, STP, MDP, DMT, etc.; strong depressants include "Reds, Yellows, Rainbows, Blues, etc."; strong stimulants include "Bennies, Co-pilots, Speed, Pep pills, etc."

The survey was conducted in the spring of 1971 in Richmond, Chesterfield, and Henrico, in the fall of 1971 in the other counties. A 10 percent random sample of the students in grades 8 through 12 was surveyed in each school. The questionnaire included 60 questions on drug attitudes and opinions, and 8 questions of a demographic nature. The broad goal of the study was to improve the quality of drug education in the region.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size Range*
Students in grades 10-12 in 51 public senior high schools in an eight county area in South Central Pennsylvania. Fall 1971.	Mid-Atl.	90-item Group-admin. question-naire	485-495
			535-542
			476-486
			1517-1533

		Weighted Percentage of Respo			
		Marijuana	Psychedelics	Amphetamines	Barbiturates
Grade 10:	Ever Used	10.4	3.2	8.2	16.1
	Regular Use	3.5	0.3	1.3	2.9
	Experimental Use	6.9	2.9	6.9	13.2
Grade 11:	Ever Used	13.7	5.2	9.8	17.8
	Regular Use	6.9	1.7	3.1	2.6
	Experimental Use	6.8	3.5	6.7	15.2
Grade 12:	Ever Used	21.0	10.2	18.1	22.4
	Regular Use	12.5	2.7	5.2	4.6
	Experimental Use	8.5	7.5	12.9	17.8
Total:	Ever Used	14.9	6.2	11.6	18.7
	Regular Use	7.5	1.6	3.2	3.3
	Experimental Use	7.4	4.6	8.4	15.4

* The sample size varies slightly by drug type due to a few cases of

REFERENCE

Stroman, Duane S., High School Drug Use Survey in South Central Pennsylvania. Final Report on Project Subgrant No. CT-P-069 for Governor's Justice Commission (Pennsylvania), Region IV, by Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania 16652, February 29, 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the principal data on the extent of illegal report (Table 5). The term "weighted" refers to the fact that the per were obtained by taking into account the relative sizes of small, medi The category called "Other Drugs" refers to drugs not listed in the qu authors did not know what drugs the students had in mind in answering mental use is defined as use of the drug "once" or "a few times"; regu the drug "about once a month", "once a week", "more than once a week". The figure for ever used is the sum of those for experimental use and In the report are data on frequency of use, variations in drug use by use. Much of the discussion is devoted to correlates of drug use.

The data were collected in 17 schools which were randomly selecte according to size, from the 51 schools in the population. The samples and seniors were randomly chosen within each school. While the data c naire findings, the study also included interviews with some students, trators, county probation officers, and police officers in the communi were located.

tion ed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size Range*			Weighted Percentage of Respondents						
						Marijuana	Psychedelics	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Glue, etc.	Other Drugs
ts	Mid-Atl.	90-item	485-495	Grade 10:	Ever Used	10.4	3.2	8.2	16.1	1.7	15.7	8.2
les		Group-			Regular Use	3.5	0.3	1.3	2.9	0.0	1.3	1.4
in		admin.			Experimental Use	6.9	2.9	6.9	13.2	1.7	14.4	6.8
lic		question-										
		naire	5 5-542	Grade 11:	Ever Used	13.7	5.2	9.8	17.8	2.3	14.3	9.5
					Regular Use	6.9	1.7	3.1	2.6	0.0	1.5	1.2
					Experimental Use	6.8	3.5	6.7	15.2	2.3	12.8	8.3
			476-486	Grade 12:	Ever Used	21.0	10.2	18.1	22.4	3.4	11.1	10.8
					Regular Use	12.5	2.7	5.2	4.6	0.0	0.8	2.0
					Experimental Use	8.5	7.5	12.9	17.8	3.4	10.3	8.8
			1517-1533	Total:	Ever Used	14.9	6.2	11.6	18.7	2.5	13.8	9.5
lvania.					Regular Use	7.5	1.6	3.2	3.3	0.0	9.2	1.5
971.					Experimental Use	7.4	4.6	8.4	15.4	2.5	12.6	8.0

* The sample size varies slightly by drug type due to a few cases of erroneous reporting.

ICE

, Duane S., High School Drug Use Survey in Central Pennsylvania. Final Report on t Subgrant No. CT-P-069 for Governor's e Commission (Pennsylvania), Region IV, lata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania February 29, 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the principal data on the extent of illegal drug use found in this report (Table 5). The term "weighted" refers to the fact that the percentages which are cited were obtained by taking into account the relative sizes of small, medium, and large schools. The category called "Other Drugs" refers to drugs not listed in the questionnaire, but the authors did not know what drugs the students had in mind in answering this question. Experimental use is defined as use of the drug "once" or "a few times"; regular use includes use of the drug "about once a month", "once a week", "more than once a week", or "almost every day". The figure for ever used is the sum of those for experimental use and regular use. Also given in the report are data on frequency of use, variations in drug use by school, and multiple drug use. Much of the discussion is devoted to correlates of drug use.

The data were collected in 17 schools which were randomly selected, after stratifying according to size, from the 51 schools in the population. The samples of sophomores, juniors, and seniors were randomly chosen within each school. While the data cited above are questionnaire findings, the study also included interviews with some students, teachers, school administrators, county probation officers, and police officers in the communities in which the schools were located.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents									
					Marijuana	Hallucinogens				Stimulants				Nar
						Hashish	Mescaline	LSD	Psilocyb n	Amphet.	Other	Barbit.	Heroin	M
All students in the two junior high schools and one senior high school comprising School District 834, Stillwater, Minnesota. June, 1971	West North Central	Suburban (10,000)	27-item self-admin. questionnaire	Junior High	8	3	2	2		2	5	1		
				Senior High	32	12	9	7	2	5	5	4	1	

REFERENCE

LaCroix, Kenneth J., Drug Abuse: A Survey of the Problem in the Stillwater Public Secondary School District 834, Stillwater, Minnesota, Mimeo, 42 p., prepared by the Family Drug Education Committee of District 834 with financial assistance from the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare Drug Abuse Pilot School District Program, June, 1971.

NOTES

The data on extent of drug use found in this survey are summarized
the questionnaire pertained to use of alcohol and tobacco, knowledge o
bility of drugs, and attitudes on drug education. There is no indicat
procedure was used; no sample size is stated. A copy of the questionn
report. It appears that reasonable steps were taken to preserve the a

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents						
					Marijuana	LSD	Uppers	Speed	Cocaine	Downers	Her
Students in secondary schools ((rades 7-12) in Hawaii. March-April 1971.	Pacific	Self-admin. questionnaire	12,929	Usage:	73.9	91.0	92.6	93.5	97.1	89.6	9
				Never	11.2	5.2	4.6	4.4	1.9	6.5	
				At least once	5.4	2.4	1.5	1.1	0.4	2.3	
				At least once/month	5.9	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.9	
				At least once/week	3.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	
				At least once/day	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	
				No response							
				Nonusers	74.6	90.9	92.7	93.4	96.6	89.9	9
				Experimenters	9.6	3.5	3.2	2.8	1.5	4.7	
				Users	10.9	2.1	1.4	1.3	0.4	2.4	
				Ex-users	3.8	2.6	1.7	1.6	0.6	2.1	
				No response	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	
				Age started:							
				Never	73.1	89.8	91.4	92.1	95.8	88.6	9
				6-10	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	
				11-12	3.5	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.3	1.0	
				13-14	10.1	3.0	2.9	2.2	0.8	3.9	
				15-16	9.0	3.5	2.4	2.4	1.0	3.7	
				17-20	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	
				No response	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.9	

REFERENCE

Hawaii, State of, Health Education Survey. Printed by the Office of Library Services, Teacher Assist Center, Publica.ion No. TAC 72-4017, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, September 1, 1971.

NOTES

In the report, the usage data summarized above are broken down by
respondents. The categories of experimenters, users and ex-users are
level. The basis of the survey was a random sample consisting of 20
dary school population of 76,723 students, stratified by districts, s
rooms. The final analysis was based on 12,929 respondents, or 16.8 p
Validity checks were built into the questionnaire. No mention is mad
to preserve the anonymity of individual respondents. However, the Su
Education, State of Hawaii, has stated in a private communication tha
serve anonymity were in fact taken.

Item No. 23

Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop)	Data Collection Technique	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens: Hashish	Hallucinogens: Mescaline	Hallucinogens: LSD	Hallucinogens: Psilocybin	Stimulants: Amphet.	Stimulants: Other	Barbit.	Narcotics: Heroin	Narcotics: Morphine	Cocaine	Inhalants
West North Central	Suburban (10,000)	27-item self-admin. questionnaire	Junior High	8	3	2	2		2	5	1			2	8
			Senior High	12	12	9	7	2	5	5	4	1	1	2	10

ug Abuse: A Survey of the Problem in the Stillwater Public
ct 834, Stillwater, Minnesota, Mimeo, 42 p., prepared by the
ommittee of District 834 with financial assistance from the
tion, and Welfare Drug Abuse Pilot School District Program,

NOTES

The data on extent of drug use found in this survey are summarized above. Other questions on the questionnaire pertained to use of alcohol and tobacco, knowledge of drug use by others, availability of drugs, and attitudes on drug education. There is no indication of whether a sampling procedure was used; no sample size is stated. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to the report. It appears that reasonable steps were taken to preserve the anonymity of the respondents.

Item No. 24

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Uppers	Speed	Cocaine	Downers	Heroin	Methadone	Glue
Pacific	Self-admin. questionnaire	12,929	Usage:	73.9	91.0	92.6	93.5	97.1	89.6	98.0	98.2	90.9
			Never	11.2	5.2	4.6	4.4	1.9	6.5	1.1	0.9	7.0
			At least once	5.4	2.4	1.5	1.1	0.4	2.3	0.2	0.3	0.9
			At least once/month	5.9	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.5
			At least once/week	3.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	<0.1	0.3
			At least once/day	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4
			No response									
			Nonusers	74.6	90.9	92.7	93.4	96.6	89.9	97.5	97.7	90.9
			Experimenters	9.6	3.5	3.2	2.8	1.5	4.7	0.8	0.7	3.9
			Users	10.9	2.1	1.4	1.3	0.4	2.4	0.3	0.3	1.0
			Ex-users	3.8	2.6	1.7	1.6	0.6	2.1	0.5	0.5	3.3
			No response	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
			Age started:	73.1	89.8	91.4	92.1	95.8	88.6	96.7	96.8	89.5
			Never	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.7
			6-10	3.5	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.3	2.6
			11-12	10.1	3.0	2.9	2.2	0.8	3.9	0.5	0.5	3.8
			13-14	9.0	3.5	2.4	2.4	1.0	3.7	0.5	0.4	1.3
			15-16	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1
			17-20	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.7	2.0
			No response									

Education Survey. Printed by the Office of Library Services,
ublication No. TAC 72-4017, Office of Instructional Services,
State of Hawaii, September 1, 1971.

NOTES

In the report, the usage data summarized above are broken down by grade level and by sex of the respondents. The categories of experimenters, users and ex-users are also broken down by grade level. The basis of the survey was a random sample consisting of 20 percent of the reported secondary school population of 76,723 students, stratified by districts, schools, grades, and homerooms. The final analysis was based on 12,929 respondents, or 16.8 percent of the population. Validity checks were built into the questionnaire. No mention is made in the report of steps taken to preserve the anonymity of individual respondents. However, the Superintendent, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, has stated in a private communication that appropriate steps to preserve anonymity were in fact taken.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in grades 6-12 in six different school systems in Southeastern Michigan Spring 1971	East North Central	41-item self-admin. questionnaire	4,101

Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Stimulants	Depressants	Inha
Never	84	93	91	94	9
Once/month or less	9	4	5	4	
Once/week or less	4	2	3	1	
More than once/week	3	1	1	1	
Daily	2	–	–	–	

REFERENCE

Roth, Rodney, "Student Drug Abuse in Southeastern Michigan and Profiles of the 'Busers." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 55-66, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on drug use "for other than medical purposes" found in Table given in the paper are drug use frequencies for users and nonusers of marijuana. The stud with the measurement and interpretation of various school, social, psychological, and fam to drug abuse.

The six school systems were in middle class suburbs of Flint, Detroit and Pontiac, Mi the students who responded to the questionnaire were a random selection from the total sc Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in grades 7-12 in the schools of Imperial, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties, California 1971	Pacific	Anonymous questionnaire	Boys: 11,429 Girls: 11,253

Any Use During Past Year	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana Boys	Marijuana Girls	LSD Boys	LSD Girls	Amphetamin Boys	Amphetamin Gir
Grade 7	9.7	5.5	1.0	1.2	6.0	3.
8	29.1	14.7	3.2	1.3	10.9	10.
9	37.2	21.3	7.6	5.0	17.9	18.
10	42.4	38.3	10.6	5.7	19.7	18.
11	41.4	29.5	10.4	7.4	18.7	17.
12	55.0	37.0	22.0	9.0	29.0	27.

REFERENCE

Digital Resources Corporation, A Model for Criminal Justice System Planning and Control, Volume III: School Surveys. Final Report prepared for Tri-County Council on Criminal Justice, Southern California Association of Governments, by Digital Resources Corporation, 444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 508, Long Beach, California 90802, July 12, 1971.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables VIII-2 through IV-14 in this report. The school district is referred to as "Bl is apparently a code name for a district considered to be repres Tri-County area indicated under "Population Surveyed". The study undertaking, designed to show how drug use patterns might be inv investigation designed to determine the levels of drug use in th schools.

The technique used was to survey all students present on a participating schools. The questionnaire, reproduced in the rep short, requesting only the information necessary to permit the m tions of the type indicated above (as well as finer breakdowns b categories of "once or twice," "three to nine times," and "ten o

Item No. 25

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
East North Central	41-item self-admin. questionnaire	4,101

Percentage of Respondents

Frequency of Use	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Stimulants	Depressants	Narcotics	Sniffing
Never	83	93	91	94	93	97
Once/month or less	9	4	5	4	4	3
Once/week or less	4	2	2	1	2	1
More than once/week	3	1	1	1	1	1
Daily	2	–	1	–	1	1

ent Drug Abuse in Southeastern
s of the Abusers." Proceedings
ational Conference on Student
, New Jersey, September 12-15,
blished, 1972 by Baywood Publishing
Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on drug use "for other than medical purposes" found in Table I in this paper. Also given in the paper are drug use frequencies for users and nonusers of marijuana. The study was concerned mainly with the measurement and interpretation of various school, social, psychological, and family variables in addition to drug abuse.

The six school systems were in middle class suburbs of Flint, Detroit and Pontiac, Michigan. Within schools, the students who responded to the questionnaire were a random selection from the total school population. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

Item No. 26

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in grades 7-12 in the schools of Imperial, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties, California 1971	Pacific	Anonymous questionnaire	Boys: 11,429 Girls: 11,253

Percentage of Respondents

Any Use During Past Year	Marijuana Boys	Marijuana Girls	LSD Boys	LSD Girls	Amphetamines Boys	Amphetamines Girls	Heroin Boys	Heroin Girls
Grade 7	9.7	5.5	1.0	1.2	6.0	3.1	0.7	0.2
8	20.1	14.7	3.2	1.3	10.9	10.0	0.2	1.0
9	37.2	21.3	7.6	5.0	17.9	18.0	2.3	2.2
10	42.4	38.3	10.6	5.7	19.7	18.9	3.4	1.5
11	41.4	29.5	10.4	7.4	18.7	17.0	2.4	0.9
12	55.0	37.0	22.0	9.0	29.0	27.0	1.0	1.0

REFERENCE

Digital Resources Corporation, A Model for Criminal Justice System Planning and Control, Volume III: School Surveys. Final Report prepared for Tri-County Council on Criminal Justice, Southern California Association of Governments, by Digital Resources Corporation, 444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 805, Long Beach, California 90802, July 12, 1971.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables VIII-2 through VIII-6 and Table IV-14 in this report. The school district is referred to as "Blackwood," which is apparently a code name for a district considered to be representative of the Tri-County area indicated under "Population Surveyed". The study was a feasibility undertaking, designed to show how drug use patterns might be inventoried, not an investigation designed to determine the levels of drug use in the Tri-County region schools.

The technique used was to survey all students present on a given day in the participating schools. The questionnaire, reproduced in the report, is very short, requesting only the information necessary to permit the making of tabulations of the type indicated above (as well as finer breakdowns by the usage categories of "once or twice," "three to ten times," and "ten or more times").

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	
Students in grades 6-12 in the public schools of Jefferson County, Colorado April 1971	Mountain	Two self-admin. question-naires (see NOTES)	Total:	1562
			Males:	808
			Females:	754
			Grade 6:	266
			7:	232
			8:	232
			9:	239
			10:	191
			11:	198
			12:	204

	Percentage of Respondents			
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates
At Least Minimal Current Use				
Males	20.3	8.5	8.4	6.6
Females	15.8	7.7	8.1	5.8
Total	18.1	8.1	8.3	6.2
Grade Level				
6th	2.6	0.8	2.6	1.9
7th	9.5	5.2	6.0	4.3
8th	16.4	9.1	9.5	7.8
9th	19.2	7.9	7.9	7.1
10th	20.9	11.0	9.9	7.9
11th	29.3	9.1	10.1	7.1
12th	35.3	16.7	13.7	8.8
Possible Abusive Current Use				
Males	4.1	3.3	1.9	2.2
Females	2.0	2.3	1.7	1.3
Total	3.1	2.8	1.8	1.7
Grade Level				
6th	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
7th	0.9	0.8	1.3	0.9
8th	3.9	4.3	2.2	3.0
9th	2.1	3.3	1.7	2.5
10th	3.7	4.2	2.1	2.6
11th	2.0	3.0	1.0	0.5
12th	10.3	4.4	4.4	3.0

REFERENCE

Braucht, G. Nicholas and Berry, K. L., A Survey of Drug Using Behavior in Jefferson County, Colorado, Public Schools. Mimeo, 69 p., prepared by Social Science Systems, Inc. for Jefferson County School District No. 1, Donald E. Shaw, Coordinator of Drug Education, April 1971.

NOTES

The data on extent of use of illegal drugs tabulated above are found in Summary Tab IV of this report. The term "At Least Minimal Current Use" means use one or more times definition of "Possible Abusive Current Use" varies by drug; for marijuana, it means use year; for the other drugs it means 10 or more times per year. In Section III of the rep by the following usage categories: 1-2 times per year, 3-9 times per year, 10+ times pe year. The data are also classified by articulation areas, which are areas corresponding and the junior and elementary schools feeding into it.

The survey was based on a random sample stratified by articulation area and grade. ministered to one randomly selected class in each stratum. Differences in sample size b ences in class size, absenteeism on the day of the survey, and the fact that one of the not participate. Each student questionnaire consisted of two parts, one of which was fi teacher. The teacher's portion (completed first) included information (in coded form) c to drug education, and ratings of the student's school achievement and social behavior. of the individual students was preserved.

Item No. 27

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Opiates	Inhalants
Mountain	Two self-admin. questionnaires (see NOTES)	Total:	1562	At Least Minimal Current Use						
		Males:	808	Males	20.3	8.5	8.4	6.6	4.2	11.4
		Females:	754	Females	15.8	7.7	8.1	5.8	3.3	10.2
		Grade 6:	266	Total	18.1	8.1	8.3	6.2	3.8	10.8
		7:	232	Grade Level						
		8:	232	6th	2.6	0.8	2.6	1.9	1.9	15.8
		9:	239	7th	9.5	5.2	6.0	4.3	2.6	13.8
		10:	191	8th	16.4	9.1	9.5	7.8	3.9	13.4
		11:	198	9th	19.2	7.9	7.9	7.1	4.2	14.6
		12:	204	10th	20.9	11.0	9.9	7.9	4.2	8.4
				11th	29.3	9.1	10.1	7.1	4.0	4.0
				12th	35.3	16.7	13.7	8.8	6.4	2.5
				Possible Abusive Current Use						
				Males	4.1	3.3	1.9	2.2	1.4	1.9
				Females	2.0	2.3	1.7	1.3	0.7	0.7
				Total	3.1	2.8	1.8	1.7	1.0	1.4
				Grade Level						
				6th	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.2	1.9
				7th	0.9	0.8	1.3	0.9	0.0	1.3
				8th	3.9	4.3	2.2	3.0	1.3	2.6
				9th	2.1	3.3	1.7	2.5	0.8	1.7
				10th	3.7	4.2	2.1	2.6	1.0	0.0
				11th	2.0	3.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
				12th	10.3	4.4	4.4	3.0	2.0	0.5

nd Berry, K. L., A Survey of
Jefferson County, Colorado,
o, 69 p., prepared by Social
for Jefferson County Schoo
E. Shaw, Coordinator of Drug

NOTES

The data on extent of use of illegal drugs tabulated above are found in Summary Tables 1, 2, and 3 in Section IV of this report. The term "At Least Minimal Current Use" means use one or more times per year, while the definition of "Possible Abusive Current Use" varies by drug; for marijuana, it means use 50 or more times per year; for the other drugs it means 10 or more times per year. In Section III of the report, breakdowns are given by the following usage categories: 1-2 times per year, 3-9 times per year, 10+ times per year and 50+ times per year. The data are also classified by articulation areas, which are areas corresponding to one senior high school and the junior and elementary schools feeding into it.

The survey was based on a random sample stratified by articulation area and grade. Questionnaires were administered to one randomly selected class in each stratum. Differences in sample size by grade were due to differences in class size, absenteeism on the day of the survey, and the fact that one of the senior high schools did not participate. Each student questionnaire consisted of two parts, one of which was filled out by the classroom teacher. The teacher's portion (completed first) included information (in coded form) on class grade level, exposure to drug education, and ratings of the student's school achievement and social behavior. Anonymity of the responses of the individual students was preserved.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Geographical Region	Sample Size	School		Percentage of Respondents						
						Marijuana	LSD	Other Psychedelics	Methedrine	Amphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Q
More than 35,000 students in 19 senior and 6 junior high schools in the East, Midwest, South and Far West. Spring 1971.	Questionnaire	East Coast	866	A	Ever tried	45.7	13.9	16.1	10.2	15.9	17.2	
					Now using	23.9	1.5	1.6	1.3	4.0	4.7	
		West Coast	1,512	B	Ever tried	46.9	17.7	19.3	15.1	21.4	19.7	
					Now using	22.8	2.8	4.6	3.2	3.6	2.6	
		Midwest	1,966	C	Ever tried	37.1	9.5	12.1	10.5	11.8	13.8	
					Now using	18.3	1.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	3.0	
		East Coast	1,636	D	Ever tried	36.2	9.5		8.3	18.0	19.3	
					Now using	19.7	1.4	2.1	0.8	5.8	8.0	
		West Coast	1,196	E	Ever tried	52.2	15.2	20.2	12.2	32.8	31.0	
					Now using	24.0	1.3	3.8	2.5	8.2	8.6	
		Midwest	3,747	F	Ever tried	34.1	10.3	16.2	14.4	15.7	18.2	
					Now using	16.7	1.2	5.4	4.8	4.2	4.3	
		East Coast	973	G	Ever tried	28.2	7.7	7.9	8.6	11.7	14.3	
					Now using	11.1	0.9	0.9	1.9	3.3	4.3	
		West Coast	2,724	H	Ever tried	26.5	8.5	11.2	11.5	13.9	14.2	
					Now using	10.7	1.7	2.2	2.6	2.6	3.0	
		East Coast	2,993	I	Ever tried	44.0	10.4	10.1	11.0	20.5	22.2	
					Now using	21.2	0.6	0.9	0.6	4.6	4.8	
		East Coast	2,827	J	Ever tried	39.3	9.1	11.3	8.7	17.5	20.9	
					Now using	18.4	0.8	1.4	1.1	3.5	4.7	
		West Coast	1,056	K	Ever tried	44.9	15.6	16.5	15.3	23.9	23.9	
					Now using	22.1	1.2	3.6	3.3	5.1	4.6	
		Southeast	947	L	Ever tried	22.7	9.2	8.1	9.0	11.3	13.0	
					Now using	9.1	1.3	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.9	
		Southeast	686	M	Ever tried	29.7	9.7	10.9	10.1	12.3	13.1	
					Now using	14.0	0.3	0.8	1.0	2.0	1.7	
		Midwest	1,341	N	Ever tried	49.1	17.5	17.7	18.6	20.4	24.5	
					Now using	25.7	2.5	3.4	4.5	4.9	4.6	
		Southeast	649	O	Ever tried	22.7	9.1	9.4	8.6	11.0	11.2	
					Now using	6.6	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.4	2.1	
		Midwest	2,356	P	Ever tried	36.9	9.1	8.9	7.8	12.1	13.6	
					Now using	13.0	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.5	1.4	
		East Coast	2,264	Q	Ever tried	36.4	8.7	8.0	8.5	12.6	16.0	
					Now using	14.3	1.1	0.8	0.8	2.1	3.9	
		West Coast	422	R	Ever tried	55.9	21.1	23.4	17.6	30.1	30.2	
					Now using	30.0	2.2	4.6	3.6	4.6	5.0	
		West Coast	1,324	S	Ever tried	58.3	20.7	19.6	13.0	19.5	23.0	
					Now using	25.4	1.9	1.4	1.0	3.2	2.9	
		East Coast	486	T	Ever tried	12.9	3.2	2.8	0.4	2.8	3.4	
					Now using	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		East Coast	649	U	Ever tried	8.4	3.6	4.1	2.7	4.4	4.7	
					Now using	2.3	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.9	1.4	
		West Coast	780	V	Ever tried	35.9	10.4	13.8	7.9	22.1	25.2	
					Now using	19.6	0.5	1.9	1.0	5.9	9.3	
		West Coast	349	W	Ever tried	35.4	8.3	11.1	10.0	16.2	20.5	
					Now using	16.5	0.6	1.5	0.9	3.6	5.1	
		West Coast	285	X	Ever tried	30.7	14.3	12.9	9.8	17.4	19.6	
					Now using	9.9	0.8	1.6	0.4	0.8	3.6	
		East Coast	1,036	Y	Ever tried	15.2	5.5	6.0	5.4	10.0	10.9	
					Now using	5.1	0.7	1.3	1.0	2.1	3.4	

REFERENCE

Elinson, Jack, A Study of Teen-Age Drug Behavior. Summary Progress Report covering the period 9/1/71 through 6/30/72 prepared by College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University for the National Institute of Mental Health under Grant Number MH-17589-03, June 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the extent of drug use found in this
The term "Now using" is an abbreviation for "Used 3 or more times in
were chosen purposively in selected communities with presumably diffe
behavior. With the exception of schools R, W, and X, which required
students could participate, the numbers of participating students (sa
reflection of the numbers of students in attendance on the day of the
respondents was preserved, and the schools are not identified. In te
schools A through S are high schools, T through Y are junior high sch
middle class suburban; D, E, and F are middle/lower-middle class subu
I, J, K, L, M, and N are large city predominantly white; and O, P, Q,
black or ethnically mixed.

Data Collection Technique	Geographical Region	Sample Size	School		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Other Psychedelics	Methedrine	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Heroin	Inhalants
Questionnaire	East Coast	866	A	Ever tried	45.7	13.9	16.1	10.2	15.9	17.2	8.2	6.0	11.7
				Now using	23.9	1.5	1.6	1.3	4.0	4.7	1.2	0.2	0.4
	West Coast	1,512	B	Ever tried	46.9	17.7	19.3	15.1	21.4	19.7	10.4	4.9	10.0
				Now using	22.8	2.8	4.6	3.2	3.6	2.6	1.1	0.2	0.4
	Midwest	1,966	C	Ever tried	37.1	9.5	12.1	10.5	11.8	13.8	9.9	3.6	9.2
				Now using	18.3	1.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	3.0	1.0	0.6	0.7
	East Coast	1,636	D	Ever tried	36.2	9.5	11.6	8.3	18.0	19.3	5.0	2.7	8.5
				Now using	19.7	1.4	2.1	0.8	5.8	8.0	0.7	0.4	0.4
	West Coast	1,196	E	Ever tried	52.2	15.2	20.2	12.2	32.8	31.0	8.9	5.6	12.4
				Now using	24.0	1.3	3.8	2.5	8.2	8.6	0.8	0.4	0.1
	Midwest	3,747	F	Ever tried	34.1	10.3	16.2	14.4	15.7	18.2	8.2	4.7	12.6
				Now using	16.7	1.2	5.4	4.8	4.2	4.3	0.6	0.6	1.1
	East Coast	973	G	Ever tried	28.2	7.7	7.9	8.6	11.7	14.3	6.7	4.8	11.6
				Now using	11.1	0.9	0.9	1.9	3.3	4.3	0.9	0.5	0.7
	West Coast	2,724	H	Ever tried	26.8	8.5	11.2	11.5	13.9	14.2	5.8	4.9	8.3
				Now using	10.7	1.7	2.2	2.6	2.6	3.0	0.5	0.1	1.1
	East Coast	2,993	I	Ever tried	44.0	10.4	10.1	11.0	20.5	22.2	8.7	5.5	11.0
				Now using	21.2	0.6	0.9	0.6	4.6	4.8	1.0	0.8	0.4
	East Coast	2,827	J	Ever tried	39.3	9.1	11.3	8.7	17.5	20.9	8.4	6.7	11.9
				Now using	18.4	0.8	1.4	1.1	3.5	4.7	0.8	1.3	0.4
	West Coast	1,056	K	Ever tried	44.9	15.6	16.5	15.3	23.9	23.9	6.6	5.4	9.3
				Now using	22.1	1.2	3.6	3.3	5.1	4.6	0.4	0.3	0.5
	Southeast	947	L	Ever tried	22.7	9.2	8.1	9.0	11.3	13.0	7.1	5.1	9.6
				Now using	9.1	1.3	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.9	1.3	0.3	1.0
	Southeast	686	M	Ever tried	29.7	9.7	10.9	10.1	12.3	13.1	8.1	5.6	7.1
				Now using	14.0	0.3	0.8	1.0	2.0	1.7	0.4	0.1	0.2
	Midwest	1,341	N	Ever tried	49.1	17.5	17.7	18.6	20.4	24.5	9.5	5.9	12.8
				Now using	25.7	2.5	3.4	4.5	4.9	4.6	1.2	0.5	0.6
	Southeast	649	O	Ever tried	22.7	9.1	9.4	8.6	11.0	11.2	11.4	8.7	11.7
				Now using	6.6	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.4	2.1	1.2	0.6	1.5
	Midwest	2,356	P	Ever tried	36.9	9.1	8.9	7.8	12.1	13.6	10.2	6.5	7.0
				Now using	13.0	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.5	1.4	0.2	0.5	0.5
	East Coast	2,264	Q	Ever tried	36.4	8.7	8.0	8.5	12.6	16.0	10.4	8.6	10.2
				Now using	14.3	1.1	0.8	0.8	2.1	3.9	0.9	2.1	0.4
	West Coast	422	R	Ever tried	55.8	21.1	23.4	17.6	30.1	30.2	8.0	4.6	14.5
				Now using	30.0	2.2	4.6	3.6	4.6	5.0	1.4	0.0	0.9
	West Coast	1,324	S	Ever tried	58.3	20.7	19.6	13.0	19.5	23.0	13.8	8.2	8.1
				Now using	25.4	1.9	1.4	1.0	3.2	2.9	1.7	1.0	0.8
	East Coast	486	T	Ever tried	12.9	3.2	2.8	0.4	2.8	3.4	1.5	1.5	7.1
				Now using	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
	East Coast	649	U	Ever tried	8.4	3.6	4.1	2.7	4.4	4.7	4.2	2.7	8.4
				Now using	2.3	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.9	1.4	0.6	0.7	1.9
	West Coast	780	V	Ever tried	35.9	10.4	13.8	7.9	22.1	25.2	9.7	3.9	11.6
				Now using	19.6	0.5	1.9	1.0	5.9	9.3	0.7	0.1	0.9
	West Coast	349	W	Ever tried	35.4	8.3	11.1	10.0	16.2	20.5	6.2	3.3	14.6
				Now using	16.3	0.6	1.5	0.9	3.6	5.1	0.6	0.0	2.1
	West Coast	285	X	Ever tried	30.7	14.3	12.9	9.8	17.4	19.6	10.5	10.2	27.1
				Now using	9.9	0.8	1.6	0.4	0.8	3.6	0.8	0.8	3.0
	East Coast	1,036	Y	Ever tried	15.2	5.5	6.0	5.4	10.0	10.9	7.4	5.6	16.3
				Now using	5.1	0.7	1.3	1.0	2.1	3.4	1.3	1.7	2.8

f Teen-Age Drug Behavior. Summary Progress Report covering the 30/72 prepared by College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia nal Institute of Mental Health under Grant Number MH-17589-03,

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the extent of drug use found in this report (Appendix 2, Table 20). The term "Now using" is an abbreviation for "Used 3 or more times in last 2 months". The schools were chosen purposively in selected communities with presumably differing patterns of youthful drug behavior. With the exception of schools R, W, and X, which required written parental consent before students could participate, the numbers of participating students (sample sizes cited above) are a reflection of the numbers of students in attendance on the day of the survey. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved, and the schools are not identified. In terms of a broad classification, schools A through S are high schools, T through Y are junior high schools; A, B, and C are upper middle class suburban; D, E, and F are middle/lower-middle class suburban; G and H are small city; I, J, K, L, M, and N are large city predominantly white; and O, P, Q, R, and S are large city, black or ethnically mixed.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Type of School System	Number of Schools	Total Enrollment	Number (%) Participating	Grade
Students in Grades 9-12 in 10 county unit and 20 separate school district high schools and freshmen and sophomores in 12 junior colleges in Mississippi 1971	South	County Unit	9	1911	1316 (69%)	9
					*M: 676	
					F: 640	
			10	1511	1121 (74%)	10
					M: 527	
					F: 594	
			9	1268	990 (78%)	11
					M: 462	
					F: 528	
			10	1127	843 (75%)	12
					M: 367	
					F: 476	
		Separate School District	8	2262	1947 (86%)	9
					M: 940	
					F: 1007	
			15	5214	3063 (59%)	10
					M: 1464	
					F: 1599	
			16	5825	3191 (55%)	11
					M: 1527	
					F: 1664	
			20	5510	3107 (56%)	12
					M: 1469	
					F: 1638	
		Junior College	11	4462	1617 (36%)	Fresh-
					M: 820	man
					F: 797	
			12	3126	1215 (39%)	Sopho-
					M: 666	more
					F: 549	

Percentage of Respondents

Usage	Marijuana		Hallucinogens LSD		Mescaline		Stimulants Amphet.		Cocaine		Barb urat
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Experimentally	4.0	1.4	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.3	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.9
Occasionally	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.6	0.6	1.1	0.4	1.8
Often	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.9
Experimentally	3.4	3.2	2.8	0.8	0.4	0.8	2.3	1.7	0.4	1.2	1.9
Occasionally	3.6	1.5	0.8	1.7	0.6	0.3	2.1	1.2	0.8	1.7	1.1
Often	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.2	0.8
Experimentally	4.3	3.2	2.5	1.5	2.1	1.8	1.5	2.8	2.9	0.3	2.9
Occasionally	2.8	2.0	1.3	0.5	0.4	0.7	2.1	0.9	1.9	1.5	2.5
Often	3.2	2.0	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.2	1.3	1.1	1.5	0.5	1.0
Experimentally	4.6	1.9	1.9	0.6	1.4	0.6	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.1	2.1
Occasionally	4.1	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.5
Often	1.9	0.2	0.0	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8
Experimentally	5.4	2.0	1.2	0.7	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.7	1.4	0.7	2.2
Occasionally	2.5	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.4	0.5
Often	1.4	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.3	0.4
Experimentally	4.8	2.6	1.2	1.2	1.3	0.5	3.0	1.6	1.5	0.5	2.0
Occasionally	3.0	1.3	1.4	0.9	0.9	0.4	1.6	0.7	1.2	1.8	1.1
Often	2.5	1.4	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.5
Experimentally	7.4	4.2	3.3	0.9	1.7	1.0	3.9	1.9	2.6	0.6	3.1
Occasionally	5.2	2.5	0.9	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.4	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.8
Often	3.9	1.5	1.1	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.0
Experimentally	6.7	3.4	2.6	1.3	2.3	1.3	4.9	1.8	2.5	1.2	3.9
Occasionally	6.5	2.4	1.9	0.3	1.4	0.9	3.1	2.3	2.1	0.9	3.4
Often	5.9	2.4	1.4	0.6	1.2	0.3	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.5	1.2
Experimentally	7.9	2.5	4.3	0.6	2.4	0.6	4.8	1.3	2.9	0.9	4.5
Occasionally	6.3	2.1	0.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	3.9	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.4
Often	4.7	0.6	1.1	0.1	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.1	1.0
Experimentally	10.5	2.7	2.5	0.7	3.0	1.0	7.6	2.9	2.1	0.5	3.6
Occasionally	7.2	3.0	2.5	0.7	1.9	0.0	5.8	2.1	1.0	2.0	2.7
Often	5.4	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.4

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Rainwater, Homer T. and Malone, Howard, Statewide Narcotics Use Survey of High School and Junior College Students. Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, Perkinston, Mississippi, 1971.

NOTES

Essentially all of the information in this report (except for data on extreme numbers in each category, and five pages of graphic presentations) above compilation. The schools were selected on the basis of an affirmati vitation to participate. No information is given as to how the participan

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	
All three high schools and four middle schools in Wilmington (Delaware) School District Spring 1971	Mid-Atl	City (80,000)	69-item self-admin. questionnaire	3,065	Users Quitters Nonusers No information

Percentage of Respondents

Hallucinogens Marijuana	LSD	Other	Stimulants Amphet.	Other	Depressants Barbit.	Tranq.	Opiates Heroin	Other	Spo Glu
7.9	2.4	2.0	4.2		3.2		2.4	2.6	2.
7.3	3.0	2.1	5.2		3.8		2.4	2.3	3.
74.8	83.9	85.6	80.5		82.4		84.8	84.5	83.
10.0	10.7	10.3	10.1		10.5		10.3	10.5	10.

REFERENCE

Wilson, Robert A. and Smith, Brenda B., Drug Use in the Wilmington School System: A Study of Drug Use Among Junior and Senior High School Students. Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, May 1972.

NOTES

This stud is part of the statewide survey cited in Item 37. The sam percent of the junior and senior high school enrollment in Wilmington, De 1971. No information is given as to how the sample was selected.

Item No. 29

Type of School System	Number of Schools	Total Enrollment	Number (%) Participating	Grade	Usage	Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens: Marijuana M*	Marijuana F*	LSD M	LSD F	Mescaline M	Mescaline F	Stimulants: Amphet. M	Amphet. F	Cocaine M	Cocaine F	Barbiturates M	Barbiturates F	Narcotics: Heroin M	Heroin F	Paregoric M	Paregoric F
County Unit	9	1911	1316 (69%)	9	Experimentally	4.0	1.4	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.3	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.9	0.6	1.2	0.8	3.8	2.0
			*M: 676		Occasionally	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.6	0.6	1.1	0.4	1.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	7.7	5.6
			F: 640		Often	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.6	1.3
	10	1511	1121 (74%)	10	Experimentally	3.4	3.2	2.8	0.8	0.4	0.8	2.3	1.7	0.4	1.2	1.9	0.7	1.7	1.5	3.2	2.2
			M: 527		Occasionally	3.6	1.5	0.8	1.7	0.6	0.3	2.1	1.2	0.8	1.7	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.1	4.8	6.2
			F: 594		Often	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.2	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.9	1.2
	9	1268	990 (78%)	11	Experimentally	4.3	3.2	2.5	1.5	2.1	1.8	1.5	2.8	2.9	0.3	2.9	1.3	1.9	0.6	2.9	2.0
			M: 462		Occasionally	2.8	2.0	1.3	0.5	0.4	0.7	2.1	0.9	1.9	1.5	2.5	1.7	0.4	0.6	5.6	4.9
			F: 528		Often	3.2	2.0	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.2	1.3	1.1	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.4	1.9	0.7
	10	1127	843 (75%)	12	Experimentally	4.6	1.9	1.9	0.6	1.4	0.6	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.1	2.1	1.3	1.6	0.2	2.4	0.2
			M: 367		Occasionally	4.1	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.6	4.6	3.1
			F: 476		Often	1.9	0.2	0.0	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.4
Separate School District	8	2262	1947 (86%)	9	Experimentally	5.4	2.0	1.2	0.7	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.7	1.4	0.7	2.2	1.0	0.8	0.5	2.9	1.4
			M: 940		Occasionally	2.5	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.4	0.5	1.1	0.2	0.3	3.9	4.0
			F: 1007		Often	1.4	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.8	1.0
	15	5214	3063 (59%)	10	Experimentally	4.8	2.6	1.2	1.2	1.3	0.5	3.0	1.6	1.5	0.5	2.0	0.7	1.5	0.5	2.2	1.9
			M: 1464		Occasionally	3.0	1.3	1.4	0.9	0.9	0.4	1.6	0.7	1.2	1.8	1.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	4.3	4.9
			F: 1599		Often	2.5	1.4	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.7	1.1
	16	5825	3191 (55%)	11	Experimentally	7.4	4.2	3.3	0.9	1.7	1.0	3.9	1.9	2.6	0.6	3.1	1.5	1.3	0.3	4.3	1.6
			M: 1527		Occasionally	5.2	2.5	0.9	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.4	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.1	1.0	0.6	5.9	4.3
			F: 1664		Often	3.9	1.5	1.1	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.3	0.4
	20	5510	3107 (56%)	12	Experimentally	6.7	3.4	2.6	1.3	2.3	1.3	4.9	1.8	2.5	1.2	3.9	1.2	1.6	0.4	3.4	1.8
			M: 1469		Occasionally	6.5	2.4	1.9	0.3	1.4	0.9	3.1	2.3	2.1	0.9	3.4	1.5	1.2	0.4	4.6	3.4
			F: 1638		Often	5.9	2.4	1.4	0.6	1.2	0.3	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.5	1.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	1.8	2.0
Junior College	11	4462	1617 (36%)	Fresh-	Experimentally	7.9	2.5	4.3	0.6	2.4	0.6	4.8	1.3	2.9	0.9	4.5	0.5	1.2	0.0	3.1	0.5
			M: 820	man	Occasionally	6.3	2.1	0.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	3.9	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.4	1.1	0.6	0.1	3.1	2.6
			F: 797		Often	4.7	0.6	1.1	0.1	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.5
	12	3126	1215 (39%)	Sopho-	Experimentally	10.5	2.7	2.5	0.7	3.0	1.0	7.6	2.9	2.1	0.5	3.6	1.0	1.3	0.1	1.5	1.2
			M: 666	more	Occasionally	7.2	3.0	2.5	0.7	1.9	0.0	5.8	2.1	1.0	2.0	2.7	2.0	0.7	0.0	4.2	5.6
			F: 549		Often	5.4	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.1

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

NOTES

Essentially all of the information in this report (except for data on alcohol, comments on extreme numbers in each category, and five pages of graphic presentations) is contained in the above compilation. The schools were selected on the basis of an affirmative response to an invitation to participate. No information is given as to how the participants were chosen.

one, Howard, Statewide Narcotics Use Survey of High School . Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, Perkinston,

Item No. 30

Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens: Marijuana	LSD	Other	Stimulants: Amphet.	Other	Depressants: Barbit.	Tranq.	Opiates: Heroin	Other	Spec. Clnc	Subst. Other	Total
City (80,000)	69-item self-admin. questionnaire	3,065	Users	7.9	2.4	2.0	4.2		3.2		2.4	2.6	2.1	1.8	11.3
			Quitters	7.3	3.0	2.1	5.2		3.8		2.4	2.3	3.4	2.0	8.9
			Nonusers	74.8	83.9	85.6	80.5		82.4		84.8	84.5	83.8	85.7	69.2
			No information	10.0	10.7	10.3	10.1		10.5		10.3	10.5	10.6	10.5	10.5

B., Drug Use in the Wilmington School System: A Study High School Students. Division of Urban Affairs, aware, May 1972.

NOTES

This study is part of the statewide survey cited in Item 37. The sample constituted about 50 percent of the junior and senior high school enrollment in Wilmington, Delaware, in the spring of 1971. No information is given as to how the sample was selected.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	N	Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Other Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates
Students, grades 8-12 in the public schools of a large New England city. January 1971	Self-admin. questionnaire		One or more times a day					
			Males	12.9	2.6	3.2	3.6	5.0
			Females	5.8	0.4	0.4	4.1	2.6
			Once or twice a week					
			Males	10.6	2.4	2.6	5.3	5.0
			Females	9.2	1.5	2.1	2.8	4.9
			A few times a month					
			Males	10.8	5.5	3.8	6.3	6.7
			Females	8.8	2.6	2.1	4.5	7.1
			Only once or a few times					
			Males	13.5	7.1	7.9	9.5	11.7
			Females	10.5	4.7	5.8	13.1	11.3
			Never used					
			Males	52.1	82.3	82.4	75.4	71.6
			Females	65.6	90.8	89.5	75.6	74.1
			Whites	58.8	87.0		75.2	73.1
			Blacks	53.8	80.1		71.5	70.3
			All Students	58	85	85	74	72
			Daily and Weekly Use					
			Grade 8	16.2	5.5	6.3	11.7	10.8
			9	14.9	4.9	5.0	7.0	7.7
			10	20.3	3.6	3.9	7.9	9.2
			11	24.1	4.4	5.0	8.6	9.9
			12	23.6	2.4	3.6	4.8	7.8
			Daily and Weekly Use by Father's Occupation					
		58	Unemployed	26.5	7.7	5.7	9.4	18.2
		229	Workman	20.2	4.0	5.3	7.2	10.6
		268	Service, Clerical worker	19.1	3.8	4.2	8.0	7.7
		236	Proprietor, manager, tech., etc.	21.1	5.2	4.3	9.5	9.5
		165	Professional	20.1	5.1	8.0	11.8	11.3
			Daily and Weekly Use by Level of Aspiration for Education					
		40	Dropout of high school	28.2	12.8	10.3	18.4	21.1
		211	Finish high school	23.2	7.0	7.0	12.8	14.0
		90	Get vocational training	18.2	4.6	7.0	13.8	12.8
		160	Junior college	22.0	5.0	4.3	9.3	8.0
		506	Four-year college	18.0	2.6	3.6	5.2	7.0
			Daily and Weekly Use by Adult Family Constellation					
		738	Mother and Father	17.8	2.8	3.9	6.9	7.7
		170	Mother only	24.7	8.4	6.0	12.6	12.0
		18	Father only	27.8	5.6	16.7	5.6	5.6
		22	Other relative	31.6	10.6	10.6	15.8	21.0
		13	Other	36.4	16.7	7.7	36.4	46.2

REFERENCE

Rollins, Joan H. and Holden, Raymond H., "Adolescent Drug Use and the Alienation Syndrome." Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 249-261, September 1972.

NOTES

Presented above are the data on frequency of drug use tabulated in this paper. Cluste on a random selection of groups (in this case classrooms) from the population being studied sample of approximately 15 percent (1,000 pupils) of the enrollment in grades 8-12. The sa certain categories in the above tabulation are shown in the column headed "N". Breakdowns categories are not give[illegible] the paper.

Students responding to the questionnaire were assured of their anonymity. The testing advance.

rveyed	Data Collection Technique	Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Other Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Glue Sniffing
des ublic large ity.	Self-admin. questionnaire	One or more times a day							
		Males	12.9	2.6	3.2	3.6	5.0	2.2	4.7
		Females	5.8	0.4	0.4	4.1	2.6	1.9	2.6
		Once or twice a week							
		Males	10.6	2.4	2.6	5.3	5.0	2.6	4.1
		Females	9.2	1.5	2.1	2.8	4.9	1.7	2.4
		A few times a month							
		Males	10.8	5.5	3.8	6.3	6.7	4.1	3.5
		Females	8.8	2.6	2.1	4.5	7.1	1.1	2.6
		Only once or a few times							
		Males	13.5	7.1	7.9	9.5	11.7	3.2	10.9
		Females	10.5	4.7	5.8	13.1	11.3	1.5	7.1
		Never used							
		Males	52.1	82.3	82.4	75.4	71.6	87.8	76.8
		Females	65.6	90.8	89.5	75.6	74.1	93.8	85.4
		Whites	56.8	87.0		75.2	73.1	93.0	83.2
		Blacks	53.8	80.1		71.5	70.3	76.4	77.8
		All Students	58	85	85	74	72	90	80
		Daily and Weekly Use							
		Grade 8	16.2	5.5	6.3	11.7	10.8	8.3	11.3
		9	14.9	4.9	5.0	7.0	7.7	5.0	7.2
		10	20.3	3.6	3.9	7.9	9.2	3.6	8.0
		11	24.1	4.4	5.0	8.6	9.9	4.4	4.3
		12	23.6	2.4	3.6	4.8	7.8	2.4	4.8
N		Daily and Weekly Use by Father's Occupation							
58		Unemployed	26.5	7.7	5.7	9.4	18.2	2.0	7.7
229		Workman	20.2	4.0	5.3	7.2	10.6	7.6	10.4
268		Service, Clerical worker	19.1	3.8	4.2	8.0	7.7	4.2	6.2
236		Proprietor, manager, tech., etc.	21.1	5.2	4.3	9.5	9.5	4.8	7.5
165		Professional	20.1	5.1	8.0	11.8	11.3	5.7	7.6
		Daily and Weekly Use by Level of Aspiration for Education							
40		Dropout of high school	28.2	12.8	10.3	18.4	21.1	10.3	18.0
211		Finish high school	23.2	7.0	7.0	12.8	14.0	7.0	11.0
90		Get vocational training	18.2	4.6	7.0	13.8	12.8	5.8	11.7
160		Junior college	22.0	5.0	4.3	9.3	8.0	6.3	7.5
506		Four-year college	18.0	2.6	3.6	5.2	7.0	3.2	4.8
		Daily and Weekly Use by Adult Family Constellation							
738		Mother and Father	17.8	2.8	3.9	6.9	7.7	4.5	6.3
170		Mother only	24.7	8.4	6.0	12.6	12.0	4.8	9.6
18		Father only	27.8	5.6	16.7	5.6	5.6	11.2	11.2
22		Other relative	31.6	10.6	10.6	15.8	21.0	10.6	15.8
13		Other	36.4	16.7	7.7	36.4	46.2	16.7	27.3

NOTES

Presented above are the data on frequency of drug use tabulated in this paper. Cluster sampling, which is based on a random selection of groups (in this case classrooms) from the population being studied, was used to select a sample of approximately 15 percent (1,000 pupils) of the enrollment in grades 8-12. The sample sizes pertaining to certain categories in the above tabulation are shown in the column headed "N". Breakdowns of the sample by other categories are not given in the paper.

Students responding to the questionnaire were assured of their anonymity. The testing was not announced in advance.

n H. and Holden, "Adolescent d the Alienation Journal of Drug Vol. 2, No. 3, , September 1972.

65

Item No.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in the junior and senior high schools (city and county) of Wake County, North Carolina November 1970 (County) February 1971 (City)	South Atlantic	32-item self-admin. questionnaire	City: 500 County: 1500

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana		Other Drugs	
	City	County	City	County
Never used	68	89	70	39
Used once or twice	22	7	24	6
Used frequently	6	3	5	2
No response received	4	1	1	2

REFERENCE

Carter, James H. and Gregory, Robert J., "Assessment of the Prevalence of Drug Abuse Among Junior and Senior High School Students of Wake County, North Carolina." N. C. Journal of Mental Health, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 21-35, Summer 1971.

NOTES

Shown above are the tabulations of the responses to the tw questions on frequency of use of illegal drugs (questions 27 an in the questionnaire used in this survey. "Other drugs" refers "...drugs such as: acid, speed, pep pills, or heroin." "City" refers to the city of Raleigh, and "County" refers to Wake Coun North Carolina.

The 1500 students were randomly selected from all of the junior and senior high schools in the county school system. Questionnaires were administered by the homeroom teacher during a "homeroom period". The survey was carried out simultaneously throughout the county school system, and assurances were given the students regarding the confidentiality of their responses. some reluctance on the part of city school officials, the city participated approximately five months later. The questionnair the proposed method of administration were the same as in the c schools. However, the city respondents were allowed to take th questionnaires home over night and to return them the following

Item No.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in grades 9-12 in 28 high schools in the vicinity of Phoenix, Arizona January 1971	Moutain	Anonymous questionnaire	Approximately 9,000

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Addictive Drugs	None o
Freshmen	19	5	8	7	2	7
Sophomores	28	10	14	13	3	6
Juniors	32	11	15	14	5	6
Seniors	36	12	18	15	5	5
Total	28	9	13	12	4	6
1968 Total	14	*	*	*	3	7

*question not asked in 1968 survey

REFERENCE

Phoenix Gazette, "Teens Believe Drug Problem Grows." Tip-Off II, Teens in Phoenix—Opinions, Facts, Fancies, Student Survey reprinted from Teen Gazette, The Phoenix Gazette, P. O. Box 1950, Phoenix, Arizona 85001, 1969, 1971 pp. 13-15.

NOTES

The figures cited above are the tabulated responses to the question: "Have you taken: ... THAT APPLY)," which was part of the Drugs and Drinking section of this survey. Amphetamines we as including speed; addictive drugs included heroin, morphine, cocaine, etc. More general data of drugs are conveyed in the tabulated responses to the question: "Have you taken drugs?" The of percentage of respondents, are shown below.

	Fr.	Soph.	Jr.	Sr.	Total Jan. 71	Total Oc
Never	78	69	66	62	69	81
Once, for an experiment	8	9	9	10	9	6
Several times	12	18	20	23	18	10
Habitually	2	4	5	5	4	1

Other drug-related questions in this section of the survey pertained to opinions and attitudes drug laws, and means of dealing with the drug problem.

The survey covered approximately fifteen percent of each grade level in the 28 participati Student participation was completely voluntary and anonymous; questionnaires were administered during a class period. Results were edited by newspaper personnel and tabulated by computer.

Item No. 32

pulation Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
udents in the nior and senior gh schools (city d county) of Wake unty, North rolina vember 1970 (County) bruary 1971 (City)	South Atlantic	32-item self-admin. questionnaire	City: 500 County: 1500

FERENCE

rter, James H. and Gregory, Robert J., "Assessment of the evalence of Drug Abuse Among Junior and Senior High School udents of Wake County, North Carolina." N. C. Journal of ntal Health, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 21-35, Summer 1971.

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana		Other Drugs	
	City	County	City	County
Never used	68	89	70	39
Used once or twice	22	7	24	6
Used frequently	6	3	5	2
No response received	4	1	1	2

NOTES

Shown above are the tabulations of the responses to the two questions on frequency of use of illegal drugs (questions 27 and 28) in the questionnaire used in this survey. "Other drugs" refers t "...drugs such as: acid, speed, pep pills, or heroin." "City" refers to the city of Raleigh, and "County" refers to Wake County, North Carolina.

The 1500 students were randomly selected from all of the junior and senior high schools in the county school system. Questionnaires were administered by the homeroom teacher during a "homeroom period". The survey was carried out simultaneously throughout the county school system, and assurances were given to the students regarding the confidentiality of their responses. After some reluctance on the part of city school officials, the city schools participated approximately five months later. The questionnaire and the proposed method of administration were the same as in the county schools. However, the city respondents were allowed to take their questionnaires home over night and to return them the following day.

Item No. 33

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Moutain	Anonymous questionnaire	Approximately 9,000

s Believe Drug Problem Grows." Tip-ix—Opinions, Facts, Fancies, Student Teen Gazette, The Phoenix Gazette, x, Arizona 85001, 1969, 1971 pp. 13-15.

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSI	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Addictive Drugs	None of These
Freshmen	19	5	8	7	2	73
Sophomores	28	10	14	13	3	66
Juniors	32	11	15	14	5	64
Seniors	36	12	18	15	5	5
Total	28	9	13	12	4	66
1968 Total	14	*	*	*	3	71

*question not asked in 1968 survey

NOTES

The figures cited above are the tabulated responses to the questic.: "Have you taken: ... (ANSWER ALL THAT APPLY)," which was part of the Drugs and Drinking section of this survey. Amphetamines were identified as including speed; addictive drugs included heroin, morphine, cocaine, etc. More general data on the use of drugs are conveyed in the tabulated responses to the question: "Have you taken drugs?" These, in terms of percentage of respondents, are shown below.

	Fr.	Soph.	Jr.	Sr.	Total Jan. 71	Total Oct. 68
Never	78	69	66	62	69	81
Once, for an experiment	8	9	9	10	9	6
Several times	12	18	20	23	18	10
Habitually	2	4	5	5	4	3

Other drug-related questions in this section of the survey pertained to opinions and attitudes on drug usage, drug laws, and means of dealing with the drug problem.

The survey covered approximately fifteen percent of each grade level in the 29 participating high schools. Student participation was completely voluntary and anonymous; questionnaires were administered by teachers during a class period. Results were edited by newspaper personnel and tabulated by computer.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Elementary and high school students in a town in the vicinity of Boston, Massachusetts May 1971	New England	Anonymous questionnaire	480 225

Percentage of Respondents

Any use during 1970-71 School Year	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cough Syrup	H
6th Grade	4	1	1	2	5	
7th Grade	9	1	5	5	1	
8th Grade	30	3	7	9	4	
High School	46	8	12	14	4	

REFERENCE

Wechsler, Henry and Thum, Denise, Drug Usage Among School-Age Youth in the Town of *_____. Mimeo., 20 p., The Medical Foundation, Inc., 29 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116, October 21, 1971.

NOTES

The data shown above are found in Table 1 in this report. "Cough syrup" refers to the kicks". The report also gives estimates of the extent of drug use obtained from parents, a

Questionnaires were distributed in a sample of "home rooms" at each grade level. The rooms were asked by graduate students, or in some cases, students from their own school to (In no instance were teachers pr[illegible]t when the questionnaires were distributed or being fil assured their answers would be anonymous and were instructed not to write their names on an Almost all the students in the selected home rooms, who were present on the day the questio completed the questionnaire.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Junior and senior high school students in a city in the vicinity of Boston, Massachusetts Fall 1970	New England	Anonymous questionnaire	1,300

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cough Syrup	Her
Students under 15 years of age						
Any use during 1970	12.9	4.7	7.3	8.0	12.3	
Use five or more times during 1970	5.8	1.2	2.4	3.2	1.3	
Students 15 years of age and over						
Any use during 1970	40.3	9.3	15.7	15.9	7.9	
Use five or more times during 1970	26.3	3.4	6.7	6.1	1.2	

REFERENCE

Wechsler, Henry and Thum, Denise, The Extent of Drug Use in the *_____ Public Schools. Mimeo., 15 p., The Medical Foundation, Inc., 29 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116, September 24, 1971.

NOTES

The data shown above are taken from Tables 1 and 2 in this report. The figures for "us during 1970" are given in those tables as percentages of the users, whereas in the above tab shown as percentages of the respondents in each classification. "Cough Syrup" refers to the "for kicks". The report also gives estimates of the extent of drug use obtained from parent personnel, as well as from students.

Questionnaires were distributed in a sample of "home rooms" at each grade level. Stude rooms were asked by graduate students, or in some cases, students from their own school to c questionnaires. (In no instance were teachers present when the questionnaires were distribu filled out.) Students were assured their answers would be anonymous and were instructed not names on any part of the questionnaire. Almost all the students in the selected home rooms, on the day the questionnaire was distributed, completed the questionnaire.

* City names deleted at author's request.

Item No. 34

g. ion land	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
	Anonymous questionnaire	480
		225

Any use during 1970-71 School Year	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cough Syrup	Heroin	Glue Sniffing
	Percentage of Respondents						
6th Grade	4	1	1	2	5	0	9
7th Grade	9	1	5	5	1	0	8
8th Grade	30	3	7	9	4	1	9
High School	46	8	12	14	4	2	4

Denise, Drug Usage Among School-
. Mimeo., 20 p.,
c., 29 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston,
ber 21, 1971.

NOTES

The data shown above are found in Table 1 in this report. "Cough syrup' refers to the use of cough syrup "for kicks". The report also gives estimates of the extent of drug use obtained from parents, as well as from students.

Questionnaires were distributed in a sample of "home rooms" at each grade level. The students in these home rooms were asked by graduate students, or in some cases, students from their own school to complete the questionnaires. (In no instance were teachers present when the questionnaires were distributed or being filled out.) Students were assured their answers would be anonymous and were instructed not to write their names on any part of the questionnaire. Almost all the students in the selected home rooms, who were present on the day the questionnaire was distributed, completed the questionnaire.

Item No. 35

g. ion land	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
	nonymous questionnaire	1,300

Students under 15 years of age	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	darbiturates	Cough Syrup	Heroin	Glue Sniffing
	Percentage of Respondents						
Any use during 1970	12.9	4.7	7.3	8.0	12.3	3.1	14.9
Use five or more times during 1970	5.8	1.2	2.4	3.2	1.3	1.1	3.0
Students 15 years of age and over							
Any use during 1970	40.3	9.3	15.7	15.9	7.9	4.8	8.4
Use five or more times during 1970	26.3	3.4	6.7	6.1	1.2	1.4	2.6

Denise, The Extent of Drug Use
Public Schools. Mimeo., 15 p.,
c., 29 Commonwealth Avenue,
16, September 24, 1971.

uthor's request.

NOTES

The data shown above are taken from Tables 1 and 2 in this report. The figures for "use five or more times during 1970" are given in those tables as percentages of the users, whereas in the above tabulation they are shown as percentages of the respondents in each classification. "Cough Syrup" refers to the use of cough syrup "for kicks". The report also gives estimates of the extent of drug use obtained from parents and school personnel, as well as from students.

Questionnaires were distributed in a sample of "home rooms" at each grade level. Students in these home rooms were asked by graduate students, or in some cases, students from their own school to complete the questionnaires. (In no instance were teachers present when the questionnaires were distributed or being filled out.) Students were assured their answers would be anonymous and were instructed not to write their names on any part of the questionnaire. Almost all the students in the selected home rooms, who were present on the day the questionnaire was distributed, completed the questionnaire.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Psychedelics	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Solvents	Heroin
All students in the six high schools of Township High School District 214, in the vicinity of Arlington Heights, Illinois December 1970	North Central	Suburban	76-item self-admin. questionnaire	13,603 (Varies slightly with drug type)	Use During Last 3 Months						
					Twice/month or less						
					Gr. 9	6.1	2.8	3.3	3.1	3.4	
					Gr. 10	9.9	5.3	6.3	4.3	3.5	
					Gr. 11	12.2	5.7	5.8	4.2	2.4	
					Gr. 12	14.2	6.6	6.7	5.3	1.8	
					All Students	10.2	4.9	5.4	4.2	2.9	
					Once/week or more						
					Gr. 9	3.4	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.5	
					Gr. 10	6.5	1.4	2.0	0.7	0.7	
					Gr. 11	8.7	1.4	2.2	0.8	0.5	
					Gr. 12	12.0	1.1	2.3	0.7	0.1	
					All Students	7.2	1.2	1.6	0.7	0.5	
					Any Use						
					Class of 1971						
					As Freshmen (1967)	5.2	2.1	2.9	0.7		
					As Sophomores (1968)	10.5	4.2	4.9	1.6		
					As Juniors (1969)	18.3	7.3	6.9	3.7		
					As Seniors (1970)	26.9	9.0	9.3	5.6		
					Class of 1972						
					As Freshmen (1968)	6.8	2.4	3.3	1.1		
					As Sophomores (1969)	13.6	5.0	5.7	3.3		
					As Juniors (1970)	21.5	8.1	8.8	5.1		
					Class of 1973						
					As Freshmen (1969)	10.1	4.2	4.8	2.0		
					As Sophomores (1970)	16.5	7.4	8.8	4.5		
					Class of 1974						
					As Freshmen (1970)	9.4	3.8	4.8	2.5		
					Users (1970)						
					Freshmen	5.0	0.9		5.5		
					Sophomores	7.4	1.9		9.2		
					Juniors	10.7	1.8		8.7		
					Seniors	15.6	2.5		8.2		
					All Students	9.1	1.7		7.8		
					Male	11.0	2.4		7.5		
					Female	7.3	1.1		8.0		

REFERENCE

Schaps, Eric; Sanders, Clinton; and Hughes, Patrick, District 214 Drug Abuse Survey: An Interim Report. Epidemiology Unit, Illinois Drug Abuse Program, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, June 1971.

NOTES

. The data cited above are derived from a sample comprising approxima target population. However, the authors are properly cautious in stati not allow them to generalize their findings to the entire student body hidden sources of bias due to absenteeism on the days of the survey, f to return answer sheets, and the unusable nature of some of the answer very reasonable efforts were made to obtain valid and reliable data, a that the sample was in many respects representative of the target popul

Item No. 36

Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents						
				Marijuana	Psychedelics	Amphet-amines	Barbit-urates	Solvents	Narcotics Heroin, Morphine	Other
Suburban	76-item self-admin. questionnaire	13,603 (Varies slightly with drug type)	Use During Last 3 Months							
			Twice/month or less							
			Gr. 9	6.1	2.8	3.3	3.1	3.4		
			Gr. 10	9.9	5.3	6.3	4.3	3.5		
			Gr. 11	12.2	5.7	5.8	4.2	2.4		
			Gr. 12	14.2	6.6	6.7	5.3	1.8		
			All Students	10.2	4.9	5.4	4.2	2.9		
			Once/week or more							
			Gr. 9	3.4	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.5		
			Gr. 10	6.5	1.4	2.0	0.7	0.7		
			Gr. 11	8.7	1.4	2.2	0.8	0.5		
			Gr. 12	12.0	1.1	2.3	0.7	0.1		
			All Students	7.2	1.2	1.6	0.7	0.5		
			Any Use							
			Class of 1971						0.1	0.4
			As Freshmen (1967)	5.2	2.1	2.9	0.7		0.1	1.1
			As Sophomores (1968)	10.5	4.2	4.9	1.6		0.7	1.9
			As Juniors (1969)	18.3	7.3	6.9	3.7		1.5	2.5
			As Seniors (1970)	26.9	9.0	9.3	5.6			
			Class of 1972						0.3	0.5
			As Freshmen (1968)	6.8	2.4	3.3	1.1		0.6	1.5
			As Sophomores (1969)	13.6	5.0	5.7	3.3		1.1	2.1
			As Juniors (1970)	21.5	8.1	8.8	5.1			
			Class of 1973						0.3	0.5
			As Freshmen (1969)	10.1	4.2	4.8	2.0		1.0	1.2
			As Sophomores (1970)	16.5	7.4	8.8	4.5			
			Class of 1974						0.7	0.6
			As Freshmen (1970)	9.4	3.8	4.8	2.5			
			Users (1970)							
			Freshmen	5.0	0.9		5.5		1.2	
			Sophomores	7.4	1.9		9.2		1.9	
			Juniors	10.7	1.8		8.7		2.5	
			Seniors	15.6	2.5		8.2		3.0	
			All Students	9.1	1.7		7.8		2.1	
			Male	11.0	2.4		7.5		2.2	
			Female	7.3	1.1		8.0		2.0	

and Hug[illegible]es, Patrick, District 214 Drug Abuse Survey: An Interim
[illegible]inois Drug Abuse Program, Department of Psychiatry, University
June 1971.

NOTES

The data cited above are derived from a sample comprising approximately 85 percent of the target population. However, the authors are properly cautious in stating that the results do not allow them to generalize their findings to the entire student body under study. There are hidden sources of bias due to absenteeism on the days of the survey, failure of some students to return answer sheets, and the unusable nature of some of the answer sheets received. However, very reasonable efforts were made to obtain valid and reliable data, and the report indicates that the sample was in many respects representative of the target population.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Stimulants Amphet.	Stimulants Other	Depressants Barbit.	Depressants Tranq.	Opiates Heroin	Opiates Other
All students Grades 7-12 in 49 schools in Delaware, including two private and six parochial schools. Fall 1970	Mid-Atl	Various	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	31,882	Users		6.8	1.4	1.5	2.7		1.6		0.7	1.1
					Quitters		6.1	2.0	1.4	4.0		2.4		0.8	1.5
					Nonusers		83.0	91.7	92.2	88.6		91.0		93.6	92.4
					No information		4.0	4.8	4.9	4.7		5.0		5.0	5.0
					Users: Male										
					Female										
					Quitters: Male										
					Female										
					Nonusers: Male										
					Female										
					No Information: Male										
					Female										
					Ever Used:	Gr. 7	2.7	0.8	0.6	1.8		1.1		0.6	0.8
						Gr. 8	5.7	1.4	1.2	3.1		1.8		1.0	1.3
						Gr. 9	10.0	2.2	1.7	5.7		3.2		0.9	2.0
						Gr. 10	16.1	4.0	3.4	8.7		5.5		1.7	3.9
						Gr. 11	21.3	5.5	4.9	10.5		6.7		1.7	3.5
						Gr. 12	27.1	8.4	7.0	15.5		7.2		2.9	7.7

(In the report these data are broken down by three counties and the cit

REFERENCE

Wilson, Robert A., Drug Use in Delaware: A Study of Junior and Senior High School Students. Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, December 1971.

NOTES

The sample, which comprises approximately 50 percent of the state's including both public and private schools, is considered by the authors whole state. Adequate measures to ensure confidentiality of the indivi validity checks in the questionnaire enhance the credibility of the res

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Stimulants Amphet.	Stimulants Other	Depressants Barbit.	Depressants Tranq.	Opiates Heroin	Opiates Other
All students Grades 7-12 in a particular rural school district Fall 1970	Mid-Atl	Rural (24,397)	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	*	Users		2.2	0.8	0.6	0.8		0.8		0.9	0.8
					Quitters		3.2	0.5	0.5	2.2		1.7		---	0.4
					Ever Used:	Gr. 7	3.0	1.5	1.5	1.5		1.5		1.5	1.5
						Gr. 8	0.6	---	---	1.1		0.6		---	---
						Gr. 9	3.3	---	---	0.8		---		---	---
						Gr. 10	7.3	2.4	2.4	4.0		3.2		0.8	0.8
						Gr. 11	9.9	0.9	0.9	6.3		6.3		---	0.9
						Gr. 12	13.3	4.1	3.1	6.1		5.1		3.1	4.1
All students Grades 7-12 in a particular suburban school district Fall 1970	Mid-Atl	Suburban (42,000) upr. mid. cl.	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	*	Users		10.6	1.4	2.2	2.9		1.5		0.4	1.0
					Quitters		8.2	3.2	2.6	6.0		2.9		0.9	2.2
					Ever Used:	Gr. 7	3.7	0.2	0.4	2.5		1.0		0.1	0.4
						Gr. 8	8.6	0.8	1.7	4.4		1.9		0.7	1.5
						Gr. 9	14.4	3.3	2.9	6.3		3.0		1.2	2.0
						Gr. 10	23.1	5.3	5.8	11.5		5.4		1.0	4.2
						Gr. 11	28.8	6.2	6.7	7.8		6.6		1.6	4.5
						Gr. 12	40.2	13.3	13.8	10.6		8.9		3.9	7.0

* not stated explicitly; varies between grades and from question to question due to non-response

REFERENCE

Londergan, Susan; Wilson, Robert A.; and McGrath, John H., "Patterns of Drug Use Among Adolescents in a Rural Community and in a Suburban Community". 41p.; Paper presented at 1971 Rural Sociological Society Meeting, Denver, Colorado (ED 052-882).

NOTES

This study is part of a statewide survey (see Item 37). The dist by the authors to be typical, respectively, of rural and suburban dis Census classifications). Good provision was made for confidentiality and internal checks were made for the consistency of responses.

Item No. 37

Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Stimulants Amphet.	Stimulants Other	Depressants Barbit.	Depressants Tranq.	Opiates Heroin	Opiates Other	Spec.Subst. Glue	Spec.Subst. Other	Total
Various	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	31,882	Users		6.8	1.4	1.5	2.7		1.6		0.7	1.1	1.0	0.9	8.3
			Quitters		6.1	2.0	1.4	4.0		2.4		0.8	1.5	3.6	1.8	8.3
			Nonusers		83.0	91.7	92.2	88.6		91.0		93.6	92.4	90.5	92.4	79.3
			No information		4.0	4.8	4.9	4.7		5.0		5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.2
			Users:	Male												9.3
				Female												6.9
			Quitters:	Male												9.0
				Female												7.2
			Nonusers:	Male												76.7
				Female												82.4
			No Information:	Male												5.0
				Female												3.5
			Ever Used:	Gr. 7	2.7	0.8	0.6	1.8		1.1		0.6	0.8	2.9	1.7	
				Gr. 8	5.7	1.4	1.2	3.1		1.8		1.0	1.3	4.9	2.0	
				Gr. 9	10.0	2.2	1.7	5.7		3.2		0.9	2.0	5.0	2.8	
				Gr. 10	16.1	4.0	3.4	8.7		5.5		1.7	3.9	5.3	3.2	
				Gr. 11	21.3	5.5	4.9	10.5		6.7		1.7	3.5	5.4	3.4	
				Gr. 12	27.1	8.4	7.0	15.5		7.2		2.9	7.7	4.6	2.6	

(In the report these data are broken down by three counties and the city of Wilmington)

Delaware: A Study of Junior and Senior High School Students. ersity of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, December 1971.

NOTES

The sample, which comprises approximately 50 percent of the state's total student population, including both public and private schools, is considered by the authors to be representative of the whole state. Adequate measures to ensure confidentiality of the individual responses, and built-in validity checks in the questionnaire enhance the credibility of the results.

Item No. 38

	Community Size (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size			Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Stimulants Amphet.	Stimulants Other	Depressants Barbit.	Depressants Tranq.	Opiates Heroin	Opiates Other	Spec.Subst Glue	Spec.Subst Other	Total
1	Rural (24,397)	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	*	Users		2.2	0.8	0.6	0.8		0.8		0.9	0.8	0.6	0.8	2.7
				Quitters		3.2	0.5	0.5	2.2		1.7		---	0.4	3.0	0.6	5.5
				Ever Used:	Gr. 7	3.0	1.5	1.5	1.5		1.5		1.5	1.5	2.2	1.5	3.1
					Gr. 8	0.6	---	---	1.1		0.6		---	---	1.7	---	3.4
					Gr. 9	3.3	---	---	0.8		---		---	---	2.5	---	5.8
					Gr. 10	7.3	2.4	2.4	4.0		3.2		0.8	0.8	7.3	1.6	8.9
					Gr. 11	9.9	0.9	0.9	6.3		6.3		---	0.9	3.6	1.8	13.5
					Gr. 12	13.3	4.1	3.1	6.1		5.1		3.1	4.1	5.1	3.1	19.4
1	Suburban (42,000) upr. mid. cl.	35-item self-admin. questionnaire	*	Users		10.6	1.4	2.2	2.9		1.5		0.4	1.0	0.7	0.7	11.3
				Quitters		8.2	3.2	2.6	6.0		2.9		0.9	2.2	4.2	2.3	10.2
				Ever Used:	Gr. 7	3.7	0.2	0.4	2.5		1.0		0.1	0.4	3.0	1.5	6.4
					Gr. 8	8.6	0.8	1.7	4.4		1.9		0.7	1.5	4.7	2.4	12.5
					Gr. 9	14.4	3.3	2.9	6.3		3.0		1.2	2.0	5.6	4.7	17.5
					Gr. 10	23.1	5.3	5.8	11.5		5.4		1.0	4.2	4.4	3.1	25.2
					Gr. 11	28.8	6.2	6.7	7.8		6.6		1.6	4.5	6.6	4.0	31.2
					Gr. 12	40.2	13.3	13.8	10.6		8.9		3.9	7.0	5.2	2.7	41.8

* not stated explicitly; varies between grades and from question to question due to non-response

rt A.; and McGrath, John H., "Patterns of Drug Use Among ity and in a Suburban Community". 41p.; Paper presented at y Meeting, Denver, Colorado (ED 052-882).

NOTES

This study is part of a statewide survey (see Item 37). The districts selected are considered by the authors to be typical, respectively, of rural and suburban districts (using Bureau of the Census classifications). Good provision was made for confidentiality of the individual responses, and internal checks were made for the consistency of responses.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in Grades 7- in Woburn, Massachusetts Winter 1970.	New England	City (37,000)	Questionnaire	450

	Percentage of Respondents				
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Narcotics
Senior High	25	8	12	4	
Gr. 12					
Gr. 11					
Gr. 10					
Junior High	9	2	3	2	1
Gr. 9					
Gr. 8					
Gr. 7					
Total					

REFERENCE

Gelineau, Victor A.; Zaks, Linda A.; Novick, Karen M.; and Camp, Joy M., Report of the Youth Study to the Woburn Community. Mimeo, 12 p., Division of Drug Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health, Boston, Mass., April 9, 1971.

NOTES

The above is a compilation of the quantitative information on drug The column headed "Any Drug" refers to those who reported any use of dr purposes. Blank spaces indicate the absence of information in the repo ten percent of the Woburn school population, but no details are given a Neither the questionnaire nor any descriptive details on it are given i say that it was carefully constructed and pretested, and had been used Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents*
All students in public and private junior and senior high schools (Grades 7-12) in Syracuse City School District in upstate New York. May 1970.	Mid-Atl	City (197,000)	Self-admin. questionnaire	2,594
				2,543
				2,834
				2,556
				2,489
				2,026
				6,320
				6,869
				1,126
				732

* Number of respondents shown, by grade and by other drug use according to marijuana use, do not add to total number of respondents (15,158), since unknown responses were not included in the data analysis.

		Percentage of Respondents			
		Marijuana	LSD	Speed	Pep Pills
Ever Used:	Gr. 7	2.5	1.0	0.6	2.5
	Gr. 8	4.6	1.9	1.4	3.6
	Gr. 9	9.7	4.0	2.5	7.7
	Gr. 10	13.9	5.1	4.2	8.9
	Gr. 11	20.0	6.1	5.0	10.0
	Gr. 12	25.5	6.5	5.6	11.7
Overall		12.1	4.0	3.1	7.2
Now Using:	Gr. 7	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.9
	Gr. 8	1.6	0.7	0.4	1.0
	Gr. 9	4.8	2.1	1.0	2.7
	Gr. 10	8.5	2.6	1.7	2.5
	Gr. 11	11.3	3.6	1.9	3.1
	Gr. 12	13.3	2.7	2.0	3.1
Overall		6.5	2.0	1.2	2.2
Tried other drugs but never tried marijuana:					
	Male	---	0.8	0.5	2.6
	Female	---	0.5	0.6	3.5
Tried other drugs of those who tried marijuana:					
	Male	(At least once) 32.0	23.3		36.1
	Female	(At least once) 25.0	22.7		43.3

REFERENCE

Babst, Dean V. and Brill, Leon, Drug Abuse Patterns Among Students in an Upstate New York Urban Area. Mimeo, 21 p., New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, New York City, February 1972.

NOTES

The questionnaire was administered to all students on the same day students responding. Validity checks for internal consistency were pr and it appears that confidentiality of the individual responses was en

Although a breakdown by specific drug was not provided, it is of i at which drug abusers in the 7th-12th grades began their drug use. The

Age at Which Drug Use Began	Grade Level		
	7th-8th	9th-10th	11th-12t
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
13 years or less . . .	69.4	18.5	6.0
14-15 years	27.8	67.1	22.6
16 years or more . . .	2.8	14.4	71.4

Item No. 39

Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Narcotics	Exempt Narcotics	Glue	Any Drug
New England	City (37,000)	Questionnaire	450	Senior High	25	8	12	4				35
				Gr. 12								48
				Gr. 11								36
				Gr. 10								22
				Junior High	9	2	3	2	1	1	1	9
				Gr. 9								12
				Gr. 8								8
				Gr. 7								7
				Total								18

ada A.; Novick, Karen M.; and Camp, Joy M., Report of the unity. Mimeo, 12 p., Division of Drug Rehabilitation, oston, Mass., April 9, 1971.

NOTES

The above is a compilation of the quantitative information on drug use found in this report. The column headed "Any Drug" refers to those who reported any use of drugs for other than medical purposes. Blank spaces indicate the absence of information in the report. The sample comprised ten percent of the Woburn school population, but no details are given as to how it was selected. Neither the questionnaire nor any descriptive details on it are given in the report, except to say that it was carefully constructed and pretested, and had been used in several other studies. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

Item No. 40

Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents*		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Speed	Pep Pills	Heroin	Volatiles
Mid-Atl	City (197,000)	Self-admin. questionnaire	2,594	Ever Used: Gr. 7	2.5	1.0	0.6	2.5	0.6	15.0
			2,543	Gr. 8	4.6	1.9	1.4	3.6	0.5	11.9
			2,834	Gr. 9	9.7	4.0	2.5	7.7	0.8	12.0
			2,556	Gr. 10	13.9	5.1	4.2	8.9	1.3	9.8
			2,489	Gr. 11	20.0	6.1	5.0	10.0	1.7	8.1
			2,026	Gr. 12	25.5	6.5	5.6	11.7	2.1	8.6
				Overall	12.1	4.0	3.1	7.2	1.2	11.0
				Now Using: Gr. 7	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.9	0.3	2.8
				Gr. 8	1.6	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.4	2.3
				Gr. 9	4.8	2.1	1.0	2.7	0.4	2.2
				Gr. 10	8.5	2.6	1.7	2.5	0.7	1.3
				Gr. 11	11.3	3.6	1.9	3.1	0.9	1.4
				Gr. 12	13.3	2.7	2.0	3.1	1.1	1.3
				Overall	6.5	2.0	1.2	2.2	0.6	1.9
				Tried other drugs but never tried marijuana:						
			6,320	Male	---	0.8	0.5	2.6	0.3	9.2
			6,869	Female	---	0.5	0.6	3.5	0.1	7.8
				Tried other drugs of those who tried marijuana:						
			1,126	Male (At least once)	32.0	23.3	36.1	10.6	34.3	
			732	Female (At least once)	25.0	22.7	43.3	6.6	26.9	

* Number of respondents shown, by grade and by other drug use according to marijuana use, do not add to total number of respondents (15,158), since unknown responses were not included in the data analysis.

n, Drug Abuse Patterns Among Students in an Upstate New York w York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, New York

NOTES

The questionnaire was administered to all students on the same day, with 90 percent of the students responding. Validity checks for internal consistency were provided in the questionnaire, and it appears that confidentiality of the individual responses was ensured.

Although a breakdown by specific drug was not provided, it is of interest to note the ages at which drug abusers in the 7th-12th grades began their drug use. These are tabulated below.

Age at Which Drug Use Began	Grade Level: 7th-8th	9th-10th	11th-12th	Total
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
13 years or less . . .	69.4	18.5	6.0	20.2
14-15 years	27.8	67.1	22.6	39.3
16 years or more . . .	2.8	14.4	71.4	40.5

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in grades 9 and 10 in a white middle class sub-urban school May 1970	East Coast	Self-admin. questionnaire	359
Students in grades 9 through 12 in an ethnically mixed inner city school June 1970	East Coast	Self-admin. questionnaire	611

REFERENCE

Haberman, Paul W.; Josephson, Eric; Zanes, Anne; and Elinson, Jack, "High School Drug Behavior: A Methodological Report on Pilot Studies." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 103-121, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana, Hashish	UPS	DOWNS	Her
Tried and still use, or stopped using	28	12	13	
Ever used one or more times	31	16	13	
Tried and still use, or stopped u	21	7	6	
Ever used one or more times	24	3	8	

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the extent of use of illegal drugs found in this paper refers to Dexedrine, Dexamyl, Benzedrine, etc; DOWNS refers to Nembutal, Seconal, Barbe etc.

The pilot studies reported in this paper were chiefly methodological in purpose. to help develop the questionnaire to be used in a national survey and to test the effic of a self-coding procedure for matching students in successive waves of the larger surv addressed was the extent to which the drug behavior of students absent from school on from that reported by those present.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
People of high school age in Pennsylvania April and May 1970	Mid-Atl.	78-item group-admin. anonymous question-naire	6,969

REFERENCE

Larimer, George S.; Tucker, Alvin H., and Brown, Ellen F., "Drugs and Youth." Pennsylvania's Health, Vol. 31, No. 4, Winter Issue - 1970 and Vol. 32, No. 4, Winter Issue - 1971 (Reprinted by Division of Public Health Education, Pennsylvania Department of Health, 1971).

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Her
Grade 7	9	8	14	16	
8	10	5	15	18	
9	14	7	13	17	
10	17	9	15	19	
11	22	13	19	20	
12	26	13	20	20	

NOTES

Reproduced above is the tabulation of percentages of respondents i of substances by grade found in this report. "Use" ranges from "a few "almost every day." The report also gives percentages of high-use resp grade, by socioeconomic level, and by residential environment. Attitud knowledge of drugs are discussed; composite descriptions are given of t user and the potential user of drugs.

The data were obtained in 35 senior and junior high schools in nin were selected as representing the urban, suburban, and rural and socioe characteristics of residents of Pennsylvania. Within schools, students randomly within each of the six grades. This was accomplished by selec name in the files by grades until the desired sample size was met.

Item No. 41

	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
d	East Coast	Self-admin. questionnaire	359
	East Coast	Self-admin. questionnaire	611

	Percentage of Respondents			
	Marijuana, Hashish	UPS	DOWNS	Heroin
Tried and still use, or stopped using	28	12	13	1
Ever used one or more times	31	16	13	1
Tried and still use, or stopped using	21	7	6	3
Ever used one or more times	24	3	8	4

, Josephson, Eric; Zanes, Anne; and
h School Drug Behavior: A Method-
Pilot Studies." Proceedings of
ional Conference on Student Drug
w Jersey, September 12-15, 1971,
hed, 1972 by Baywood Publishing
Drive, Farmingdale, New York

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the extent of use of illegal drugs found in this paper (Table 9). UPS refers to Dexedrine, Dexamyl, Benzedrine, etc; DOWNS refers to Nembutal, Seconal, Barbs, Yellow Jackets, etc.

The pilot studies reported in this paper were chiefly methodological in purpose. They were intended to help develop the questionnaire to be used in a national survey and to test the efficacy and reliability of a self-coding procedure for matching students in successive waves of the larger survey. Another issue addressed was the extent to which the drug behavior of students absent from school on a given day differs from that reported by those present.

Item No. 42

lation Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
le of high school in Pennsylvania l and May 1970	Mid-Atl.	78-item group-admin. anonymous question-naire	6,969

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Glue
Grade 7	9	8	14	16	10	13
8	10	9	15	18	10	12
9	14	7	13	17	7	10
10	17	9	15	19	9	11
11	22	13	19	20	10	8
12	26	13	20	20	7	7

RENCE

mer, George S.; Tucker, Alvin H., and Brown, Ellen F.,
gs and Youth." Pennsylvania's Health, Vol. 31, No. 4,
er Issue - 1970 and Vol. 32, No. 4, Winter Issue -
(Reprinted by Division of Public Health Education,
sylvania Department of Health, 1971)

NOTES

Reproduced above is the tabulation of percentages of respondents indicating use of substances by grade found in this report. "Use" ranges from "a few times" through "almost every day." The report also gives percentages of high-use respondents by grade, by socioeconomic level, and by residential environment. Attitudes toward and knowledge of drugs are discussed; composite descriptions are given of the non-user, the user and the potential user of drugs.

The data were obtained in 35 senior and junior high schools in nine counties which were selected as representing the urban, suburban, and rural and socioeconomic level characteristics of residents of Pennsylvania. Within schools, students were selected randomly within each of the six grades. This was accomplished by selecting every fifth name in the files by grades until the desired sample size was met.

75

75

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in grades 10, 11 and 12 in five schools in the metropolitan area of Houston, Texas Spring, 1970	West South Central	Interview	535

	Percent of Respondents in Each Category (N=535)	Percent in Each Category Who are Users of Marijuana	Percent in Each School Who are Users: Ethnically Heterogeneous (N=73)	Ethnically Heterogeneous	Black (N=101)
			Black (N=127)		
Sex					
Male	37.5	32.8	25.0	33.3	18.5
Female	62.5	17.7	4.6	11.8	0.0
Grade Level					
10th	39.3	16.8	9.5	4.8	0.0
11th	42.0	31.7	16.7	24.0	6.5
12th	18.6	22.9	15.9	38.5	20.0
Ethnicity					
Anglo	39.3	39.2	-	-	-
Black	45.1	10.8	-	-	-
Mexican American	12.5	21.9	-	-	-
Other	3.1	12.5	-	-	-
Family Intactness					
Parents living together	76.4	25.6	-	-	-
Parents separated	10.0	17.0	-	-	-
Parents divorced	13.6	18.8	-	-	-
Friends' Use of Marijuana					
Practically all	11.4	86.7	100.0	50.0	75.0
More than half	8.5	72.7	50.0	100.0	0.0
Only a few	27.4	24.3	26.3	33.3	12.5
None	19.7	2.9	3.7	9.1	0.0
Don't know	33.0	1.7	0.0	5.9	0.0
Parents' Use of Drugs					
Yes	4.4	65.2	0.0	100.0	100.0
No	63.2	31.4	18.8	40.0	7.4
Don't know	32.4	2.4	0.0	5.4	0.0

REFERENCE

Preston, James D. and Fry, Patricia A., "Marijuana Use Among Houston High School Students." Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 52, pp. 170-176, 1971.

NOTES

The above data on marijuana use in relation to various sociocultural variables are found in... The schools had been selected to represent a wide range of socioeconomic and cultural differences... headings in the above table. The following data on regularity of use for the total sample (N=53... in the paper:

Many times:	11 percent
Several times (more than 3):	7 percent
1-3 times:	6 percent

Within schools, the students selected were those enrolled in sections of required classes a... designated time. No claim is made by the authors that the sample is representative of all Houst... were interviewed in groups, and completed individual interview schedules. Anonymity of the resp...

Item No. 43

veyed ades in n the rea xas	Geog. Region West South Central	Data Collection Technique Interview	Sample Size 535

	Percent of Respondents in Each Category (N=535)	Percent in Each Category Who are Users of Marijuana	Percent in Each School Who are Users of Marijuana: Black (N=127)	Ethnically Heterogeneous (N=73)	Black (N=101)	Anglo-Lower-Middle (N=113)	Anglo-Upper-Middle (N=121)
Sex							
Male	37.5	32.8	25.0	33.3	18.5	31.6	55.3
Female	62.5	17.7	4.6	11.8	0.0	20.5	44.4
Grade Level							
10th	39.3	16.8	9.5	4.8	0.0	26.4	66.7
11th	42.0	31.7	16.7	24.0	6.5	18.8	47.3
12th	18.6	22.9	15.9	38.5	20.0	20.0	0.0
Ethnicity							
Anglo	39.3	39.2	-	-	-	-	-
Black	45 1	10.8	-	-	-	-	-
Mexican American	12.5	21.9	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3.1	12.5	-	-	-	-	-
Family Intactness							
Parents living together	76.4	25.6	-	-	-	-	-
Parents separated	10.0	17.0	-	-	-	-	-
Parents divorced	13.6	18.8	-	-	-	-	-
Friends' Use of Marijuana							
Practically all	11.4	86.7	100.0	0.0	75.0	88.2	90.6
More than half	8.5	72.7	50.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	79.2
Only a few	27.4	24.3	26.3	33.3	12.5	25.0	22.5
None	19.7	2.9	3.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Don't know	33.0	1.7	0.0	5.9	0.0	3.1	0.0
Parents' Use of Drugs							
Yes	4.4	65.2	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	56.3
No	63.2	31.4	18.8	40.0	7.4	31.4	56.0
Don't know	32.4	2.4	0.0	5.4	0.0	2.6	5.3

NOTES

The above data on marijuana use in relation to various sociocultural variables are found in Table 3 in this paper. The schools had been selected to represent a wide range of socioeconomic and cultural differences, as indicated by the headings in the above table. The following data on regularity of use for the total sample (N=535) are found in Table 2 in the paper:

Many times:	11 percent
Several times (more than 3):	7 percent
1-3 times:	6 percent

Within schools, the students selected were those enrolled in sections of required classes and who were free at the designated time. No claim is made by the authors that the sample is representative of all Houston adolescents. Respondents were interviewed in groups, and completed individual interview schedules. Anonymity of the respondents was assured.

D. and Fry, Patricia A.,
Among Houston High School
cial Science Quarterly,
170-178, 1971.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Public school students in Grades 8-12 in white, non-metropolitan, noncollege communities of the Midwest. November-December 1969.	Mid-West	(See Notes)	190-item group-admin. opinionnaire	4,220 *M:2,131 F:2,089
				816 907 823 867 807
				1,181 1,909 1,130

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Amphetamines	
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F
Never Used	83.7	91.7	9[illegible]1	96.0	91.8	[illegible]
Once	4.4	2.6	3.1	1.9	2.5	[illegible]
2-4 times	3.3	2.2	2.2	1.0	2.8	[illegible]
5-7 times	1.8	0.7	1.3	0.8	0.8	[illegible]
8 or more times	6.8	2.7	2.3	0.4	2.1	[illegible]
Ever used by Age						
13 and under	5.0		3.0		[illegible]	
14	6.5		5.0		[illegible]	
15	10.3		6.0		[illegible]	
16	18.2		9.6		[illegible]	
17 and over	22.1		9.5		11	
Ever used by Community Type						
Community A	20.8		10.3		[illegible]	
Community B	10.6		6.1		[illegible]	
Community C	6.3		3.4		[illegible]	

*M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Hager, David L.; Vener, Arthur M.; and Stewart, Cyrus S., "Patterns of Adolescent Drug Use in Middle America". Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 292-297, 1971.

NOTES

The drug categories cited above are described in the paper as inclu

Hallucinogens: LSD, STP, mescaline,
Amphetamines: Benzedrine, Dexedrine, Methedrine,
and Hard Drugs: heroin, cocaine, and morphine.

The "Ever Used" data were obtained by adding the figures given in the p
use categories as cited in the first tabulation above. The survey was
ties, the characteristics of which are described in the paper. The re
primarily affluent professionals and managers; Community B is composed
upper lower class levels; Community C is primarily a working-class semi
tions of the three are about the same (approximately 15,000), and each
and one junior high. Complete anonymity of the respondents was assured
not identified in the paper. High internal consistency in the response

82

83

Item No. 44

Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Mid-West	(See Notes)	190-item group-admin. opinionnaire	4,220 *M:2,131 F:2,089

	Percentage of Respondents							
	Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Amphetamines		Hard Drugs	
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F
Never Used	83.7	91.7	91.1	96.0	91.8	94.8	96.0	98.4
Once	4.4	2.6	3.1	1.9	2.5	2.2	1.7	0.8
2-4 times	3.3	2.2	2.2	1.0	2.8	1.3	0.8	0.4
5-7 times	1.8	0.7	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.1
8 or more times	6.8	2.7	2.3	0.4	2.1	1.3	0.9	0.2
Ever used by Age								
13 and under	5.0		3.0		3.3		2.6	
14	6.5		5.0		4.8		2.8	
15	10.3		6.0		5.8		3.0	
16	18.2		9.6		9.3		3.0	
17 and over	22.1		9.5		11.1		2.7	
Ever used by Community Type								
Community A	20.8		10.3		9.6		2.9	
Community B	10.6		6.1		6.9		3.0	
Community C	6.3		3.4		3.8		2.7	

*M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

816	
907	
823	
867	
807	
1,181	
1,909	
1,130	

NOTES

The drug categories cited above are described in the paper as including the following:

Hallucinogens: LSD, STP, mescaline,
Amphetamines: Benzedrine, Dexedrine, Methedrine,
and Hard Drugs: heroin, cocaine, and morphine.

The "Ever Used" data were obtained by adding the figures given in the paper for the corresponding use categories as cited in the first tabulation above. The survey was conducted in three communities, the characteristics of which are described in the paper. The residents of Community A are primarily affluent professionals and managers; Community B is composed mainly of lower middle and upper lower class levels; Community C is primarily a working-class semi-rural area. The populations of the three are about the same (approximately 15,000), and each has one public high school and one junior high. Complete anonymity of the respondents was assured, and the communities are not identified in the paper. High internal consistency in the response patterns was demonstrated.

ur M.; and Stewart, Cyrus S., "Patterns of Adolescent Drug Use
of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 292-297, 1971.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Junior and senior high students in the Dallas Independent School District, Texas October 21, 1969	West South Central	Group-admin. questionnaire	56,745

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana or THC	Hashish	LSD	Morning Glory Seeds	Mescaline or Peyote	STP, etc,	Benzedrine, etc.	Nembutal etc.	Cocaine	Codeine, etc.
Use at Least One Time										
Grade 7	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3
8	6	2	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	3
9	9	4	5	4	3	4	6	5	4	5
10	11	5	5	3	4	4	7	5	4	5
11	14	6	6	3	5	5	8	5	4	6
12	17	7	7	3	6	5	8	5	5	7
Use Ten or More Times										
Grade 7	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
8	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
9	3	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	1	<1	<1	<1
10	4	1	1	<1	<1	<1	2	<1	<1	<1
11	6	2	2	<1	1	1	2	1	<1	1
12	8	2	2	<1	1	1	3	1	1	2
Use at Least One Time This Week										
Grade 7	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
8	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
10	5	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
11	6	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2
12	8	3	3	2	2	2	4	2	2	3

REFERENCE

Gossett, John T.; Lewis, Jerry M.; and Phillips, Virginia Austin, "Extent and Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use as Reported by 56,745 Students." The Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 216, No. 9, pp. 1464-1470, May 31, 1971.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables 1, 2, and 3 in this paper. STP, etc. includes Psilocybin; Benzedrine, etc. includes Benzedrine, Dexedrine, Desoxyn, or Methedrine ("speed"); Nembutal, Amytal, Seconal, or Tuinal; Codeine, etc. includes Codeine, Demerol, paregoric, terpin and Solvent Inhalants include gasoline, paint thinner, cleaning solvents, nail polish remover, et or freon. Other drug categories for which data are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3 include aerosol s alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, a variety of nonprescription drug types, prescription tranquiliz or not previously listed drug types.

The questionnaire was administered in all 43 junior and senior high schools in the Dallas I District on the same day. An attempt was made to reach every student present in school on that d respondents was preserved.

Item No. 45

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
West South Central	Group-admin. questionnaire	56,745

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana or THC	Hashish	LSD	Morning Glory Seeds	Mescaline or Peyote	STP, etc,	Benzedrine, etc.	Nembutal etc.	Cocaine	Codeine, etc.	Heroin or Morphine	Solvent Inhalants
Use at Least One Time												
Grade 7	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	5
8	6	2	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	9
9	9	4	5	4	3	4	6	5	4	5	3	11
10	11	5	5	3	4	4	7	5	4	5	3	9
11	14	6	6	3	5	5	8	5	4	6	4	7
12	17	7	7	3	6	5	8	5	5	7	4	7
Use Ten or More Times												
Grade 7	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1
8	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1
9	3	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	2
10	4	1	1	<1	<1	<1	2	<1	<1	<1	<1	2
11	6	2	2	<1	1	1	2	1	<1	1	<1	1
12	8	2	2	<1	1	1	3	1	1	2	<1	1
Use at Least One Time This Week												
Grade 7	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
8	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3
9	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	4
10	5	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
11	6	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
12	8	3	3	2	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	2

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables 1, 2, and 3 in this paper. STP, etc. includes STP, DMT, DET, MDA, Psilocybin; Benzedrine, etc. includes Benzedrine, Dexedrine, Desoxyn, or Methedrine ("speed"); Nembutal, etc. includes Nembutal, Amytal, Seconal, or Tuinal; Codeine, etc. includes Codeine, Demerol, paregoric, terpin hydrate, or Robitussin; and Solvent Inhalants include gasoline, paint thinner, cleaning solvents, nail polish remover, ether, liquid metal, or freon. Other drug categories for which data are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3 include aerosol sprays, airplane glue, alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, a variety of nonprescription drug types, prescription tranquilizers, and several unknown or not previously listed drug types.

The questionnaire was administered in all 43 junior and senior high schools in the Dallas Independent School District on the same day. An attempt was made to reach every student present in school on that day. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

is, Jerry M.; and Phillips,
tent and Prevalence of Illicit
by 56,745 Students." The Journal
al Association, Vol. 216, No. 9,
, 1971.

Item No. 46

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique
High school seniors in the state of Florida Spring 1969	South Atlantic	Self-admin. mail questionnaire

Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana
	Sex	
419	Male	18
474	Female	9
	Race	
739	White	14
150	Black	10
	Residence	
282	Large city (greater than 50,000 population)	17
276	Medium city (25,000-50,000 population)	14
204	Small city (less than 25,000 population)	9
125	Rural	8
	Father's Education	
160	College degree	21
206	Some college or business school	14
211	High School graduate	12
312	Less than high school	11
	Family Income	
205	Over $12,000	20
301	$8,000 to 11,999	12
273	$4,000 to 7,999	12
90	Less than $4,000	9

REFERENCE

Clarke, James W. and Levine, E. Lester, "Marijuana Use, Social Discontent and Political Alienation: A Study of High School Youth." The American Political Science Review, Vol. LXV, No. 1, pp. 120-130, March 1971.

NOTES

Presented above are the data on marijuana use (percentages who are users in each classification) found in this paper (Table 1). As the title indicates, the paper is concerned with social discontent and political alienation in relation to marijuana use.

This survey was based on an adjusted statewide random sample of 1057 high school seniors. The response rate was approximately 85 percent (varies slightly by classification, as shown above under Sample Size). The questionnaires were mailed to the principals of participating high schools, who were asked to administer them and forward the returns collectively.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
High school students in an affluent suburban community within commuting distance from New York City February 1969	Mid-Atl.	75-item self-admin. questionnaire	1,704

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	"Speed"	Heroin	Glue Sniff
Never tried it and would not like to try it	60	85	85	97	89
Never tried it but would like to try it	8	5	3	1	2
Tried it once	8	2	5	1	6
Use it once in a while	12	3	6	0.5	2
Use it regularly	12	1	0.6	<0.1	<0.1

REFERENCE

Tec, Nechama, "Drugs Among Suburban Teenagers: Basic Findings." Soc. Sci. & Med., Vol. 5, pp. 77-84, 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the principal data on the extent of use of illici drugs found A large part of the discussion is concerned with attitudes towar marijuana.

Questionnaires were given to all students present on the day of the survey; the part on a voluntary basis was 94 percent. Anonymity of the respondents was emphasized.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in six high schools in northern New Jersey 1969	Mid-Atl.	89-item self-admin. questionnaire	5,614

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Hallucinogens	Stimulants	"Speed"	Barbiturates	Heroi
Current Use							
Freshmen	7.8	1.2	2.7	3.6	0.4	3.1	0.8
Sophomores	13.3	1.9	4.7	5.3	1.0	5.0	0.4
Juniors	20.5	3.6	9.2	9.1	1.3	7.3	0.9
Seniors	23.6	4.1	10.2	10.1	1.2	6.5	0.7
Frequency of Use							
Hardly ever	28.0	N.A.*	45.3	49.1	N.A.	57.8	N.A.
Less than once a week		81.7			64 4		51.3
Once or twice per month	30.6	N.A.	39.3	26.0	N.A.	26.4	N.A.
At least once per week	24.0	18.3	11.5	13.1	35.6	7.6	48.7
Twice a week or more	17.5	N.A.	4.0	11.8	N.A.	8.2	N.A.
Past Use							
Freshmen							
Sophomores							
Juniors							
Seniors							

*N.A. = Not Asked

REFERENCE

Wolfson, Edward A.; Lavenhar, Marvin A.; Blum, Richard; Quinones, Mark A.; Einstein, Stanley; and Louria, Donald B., "Survey of Drug Abuse in Six New Jersey High Schools: I-Methodology and General Findings." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 9-32, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables 2, 3, and 4 of this paper. Hallucinogens incl "Speed" is defined as methamphetamine (intravenous). "Other substances" are primarily glue and non-prescription cough medicine. "Any Drug" is an abbreviation for "any drug for other than med

The selection of the six schools was based on a variety of personal and professional contact was, therefore, not intended to reflect the demographic, economic and racial diversity of the st schools were located in predominantly white and economically middle to upper middle class suburb response rate ranged from a low of 78 percent to a high of 91 percent. Questionnaires were comp a voluntary and anonymous basis.

Item No. 47

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Mid-Atl.	75-item self-admin. questionnaire	1,704

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	"Speed"	Heroin	Glue Sniffing
Never tried it and would not like to try it	60	85	85	97	89
Never tried it but would like to try it	8	5	3	1	2
Tried it once	8	2	5	1	6
Use it once in a while	12	3	6	0.5	2
Use it regularly	12	1	0.6	<0.1	<0.1

NOTES

rugs Among Suburban Teenagers: Basic Findings."
, Vol. 5, pp. 77-84, 1971.

Summarized above are the principal data on the extent of use of illicit drugs found in this paper. A large part of the discussion is concerned with attitudes toward marijuana.

Questionnaires were given to all students present on the day of the survey; the participation rate on a voluntary basis was 94 percent. Anonymity of the respondents was emphasized.

Item No. 48

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Mid-Atl.	89-item self-admin. questionnaire	5,614

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Hallucinogens	Stimulants	"Speed"	Barbiturates	Heroin	Oth r Substances	Any Drug Males	Any Drug Females
Current Use										
Freshmen	7.8	1.2	2.7	3.6	0.4	3.1	0.8	8.8	12.9	14.1
Sophomores	13.3	1.9	4.7	5.3	1.0	5.0	0.4	10.6	20.6	20.8
Juniors	20.5	3.6	9.2	9.1	1.3	7.3	0.9	8.3	23.6	26.6
Seniors	23.6	4.1	10.2	10.1	1.2	6.5	0.7	6.0	28.3	25.3
Frequency of Use										
Hardly ever	28.0	N.A.*	45.3	49.1	N.A.	57.8	N.A.	78.0		
Less than once a week		81.7			64 4		51.3			
Once or twice per month	30.6	N.A.	39.3	26.0	N.A.	26.4	N.A.	13.2		
At least once per week	24.0	18.3	11.5	13.1	35.6	7.6	48.7	6.0		
Twice a week or more	17.5	N.A.	4.0	11.8	N.A.	8.2	N.A.	2.8		
Past Use									4.8	4.9
Freshmen									7.5	6.8
Sophomores									8.1	9.5
Juniors									11.1	11.7
Seniors										

*N.A. = Not Asked

venhar, Marvin A.; Blum, Richard;
stein, Stanley; and Louria, Donald
use in Six New Jersey High
y and General Findings." Proceed-
rnational Conference on Student
New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971,
1972 by Baywood Publishing Company,
ingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Tables 2, 3, and 4 of this paper. Hallucinogens include hashish but not LSD. "Speed" is defined as methamphetamine (intravenous). "Other substances" are primarily glue and other vapors and include non-prescription cough medicine. "Any Drug" is an abbreviation for "any drug for other than medically approved reasons".

The selection of the six schools was based on a variety of personal and professional contacts of the authors, and was, therefore, not intended to ref'ect the demographic, economic and racial diversity of the state of New Jersey. The schools were located in predominantly white, and economically middle to upper middle class suburban neighborhoods. The response rate ranged from a low of 78 percent to a high of 91 percent. Questionnaires were completed by the students on a voluntary and anonymous basis.

Population Surveyed	Geog. [illegible]tion	Data Collection Techni[illegible]	Number of Respondents
High school students in Chittenden County, Vermont Spring 1968	England	Group-admin. anonymous questionnaire	Urban Schools: 2191 Rural Schools: 852

	Percentage of Respondents				
	Non-Users		Admitted Drug Users		Poter
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urb
Total	75.8	80.6	7.1	5.0	17.
Sex					
Male	71.5	78.6	9.7	6.3	18.
Female	80.2	82.2	4.4	4.0	15.
Class Standing					
Top	73.5	83.1	6.9	4.6	19.
Middle	76.1	79.0	7.5	5.3	16.
Lower	76.4	73.5	6.6	8.8	17.
Grade					
Sophomore	77.5	80.7	4.7	5.3	17.
Junior	76.1	79.6	6.7	5.7	17.
Senior	7[illegible].9	80.9	9.7	3.7	16.
Socioeconomic Status					
High 1	74.8	75.5	7.7	6.4	17.
2	74.3	76.0	9.2	8.8	16.
3	78.2	84.0	5.5	4.2	16.
Low 4	83.3	90.9	4.8	1.5	11.
Education of Parent (Father)					
Grade School	79.3	85.6	5.1	3.4	15.
High School	78.6	81.7	5.6	4.9	15.
College	69.7	74.7	10.6	6.6	19.

REFERENCE

Leahy, Patrick J.; Steffenhagen, Ronald A.; and Levine, Bruce L., "A Study of Drug Use Patterns of High School Students in the State of Vermont." Drug Dependence and Abuse Resource Book, Chicago, National District Attorneys Association, 1971, pp. 275-280.

NOTES

The data tabulated above have been obtained from Table 1 in t
calculating the percentages with reference to the total number i
fication. While the paper refers to "drug users", the only drug s
referred to is marijuana. Thus, "admitted drug users" are those
to using marijuana. "Potential drug users" are those who admitt
possibility of using drugs if the opportunity were available. Th
is not included in "non-users".

The objective of this study was to obtain an estimate of drug
high school students in Vermont by surveying all high school stud
county. Chittenden County was selected as representative of both
and urban areas of the state. In all of the public high schools
all members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes were su
same day without prior announcement.

The survey included a neurotic index, and a major finding of t
that drug use is significantly associated with emotional instabil

tion Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
chool students	New	Group-	Urban Schools: 2191
tenden	England	admin.	Rural Schools: 852
Vermont		anonymous	
1968		questionnaire	

Percentage of Respondents

	Non-Users		Admitted Drug Users		Potential Drug Users	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Total	75.8	80.6	7.1	5.0	17.1	14.3
Sex						
Male	71.5	78.6	9.7	6.3	18.8	14.9
Female	80.2	82.2	4.4	4.0	15.4	13.8
Class Standing						
Top	73.5	83.1	6.9	4.6	19.6	12.2
Middle	76.1	79.0	7.5	5.3	16.4	15.7
Lower	76.4	73.5	6.6	8.8	17.0	17.6
Grade						
Sophomore	77.5	80.7	4.7	5.3	17.7	14.0
Junior	76.1	79.6	6.7	5.7	17.1	14.6
Senior	73.9	80.9	9.7	3.7	16.4	15.3
Socioeconomic Status						
High 1	74.8	75.5	7.7	6.4	17.5	18.2
2	74.3	70.0	9.2	8.8	16.4	21.2
3	78.2	84.0	5.5	4.2	16.3	11.7
Low 4	83.3	90.9	4.8	1.5	11.9	7.6
Education of Parent (Father)						
Grade School	79.3	85.6	5.1	3.4	15.6	11.0
High School	78.6	81.7	5.6	4.9	15.8	13.4
College	69.7	74.7	10.6	6.6	19.7	18.8

NCE

Patrick J.; Steffenhagen, Ronald A,; and Levine, Bruce L., y of Drug Use Patterns of High School Students in the State ont." Drug Dependence and Abuse Resource Book, Chicago, l District Attorneys Association, 1971, pp. 275-280.

NOTES

The data tabulated above have been obtained from Table 1 in this paper by calculating the percentages with reference to the total number in each classification. While the paper refers to "drug users", the only drug specifically referred to is marijuana. Thus, "admitted drug users" are those who admitted to using marijuana. "Potential drug users" are those who admitted to the possibility of using drugs if the opportunity were available. This group is not included in "non-users".

The objective of this study was to obtain an estimate of drug usage by high school students in Vermont by surveying all high school students in one county. Chittenden County was selected as representative of both the rural and urban areas of the state. In all of the public high schools in the county, all members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes were surveyed on the same day without prior announcement.

The survey included a neurotic index, and a major finding of the study is that drug use is significantly associated with emotional instability.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents M*	Number of Respondents F*
Students in all public high schools (18) in the city of Portland and metropolitan Multnomah County, Oregon. Spring 1968	Pacific	City and County (555,700)	Verbal instruction and simultaneous screen presentation made by surveyor and questionnaire for recording of answers by students	365 363 329 285	378 365 299 299

	Percentage of Respondents										
	Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Amphetamines		Cocaine		Barbiturates		Sedati Tranqu
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Ever Used:											
Freshmen	7.6	3.4	4.9	2.1	9.8	7.4	2.6	0.6	5.7	3.4	17.8
Sophomores	14.6	9.0	7.1	5.6	11.3	12.3	2.4	1.9	8.5	9.0	19.1
Juniors	20.1	9.3	8.8	3.7	13.9	14.1	1.8	1.0	7.9	11.4	20.3
Seniors	24.9	12.1	7.1	2.0	14.0	13.1	3.9	0.7	9.5	7.7	22.5
Frequency of use:											
1-5 times:											
Freshmen	3.0	2.6	3.8	1.3	6.6	5.8	1.6	0.3	4.4	2.9	14.0
Sophomores	10.2	3.0	5.5	4.6	6.6	7.4	1.6	1.4	6.3	6.8	15.2
Juniors	8.8	4.3	5.2	3.0	8.2	11.4	1.5	1.0	6.1	9.4	17.0
Seniors	13.3	7.4	4.6	[illegible]	9.1	8.4	2.8	0.7	6.0	5.0	16.8
6-15 times:											
Freshmen	3.0	0.3	0.8	0.0	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.7
Sophomores	1.4	2.7	0.0	0.5	3.1	2.2	0.0	0.5	1.4	1.1	2.5
Juniors	5.8	1.0	1.5	0.7	3.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.0	2.4
Seniors	4.9	1.7	1.8	0.7	2.1	3.0	0.7	0.0	1.4	2.0	3.2
16+ times:											
Freshmen	1.6	0.5	0.3	0.8	1.6	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.5	1.1
Sophomores	3.0	3.3	1.6	0.5	1.6	2.7	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.1	1.4
Juniors	5.5	4.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.6	1.0	0.9
Seniors	6.7	3.0	0.7	0.3	2.8	1.7	0.4	0.0	2.1	0.7	2.5

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Johnson, Kit G.; Donnelly, John H.; Scheble, Robert; Wine, Richard L.; and Weitman, Morris, "Survey of Adolescent Drug Use I -- Sex and Grade Distribution". American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 61, No. 12, pp. 2418-2432, December 1971.

NOTES

A systematic 10 percent sample (total size: 3,476) was drawn from t community's 18 public high schools. It should be noted that the data ci the responses of 2,683, or 77.2 percent of the total sample. Of the re who failed to identify their sex and/or grade and were therefore exclude The balance of 724 were discarded from the data analysis for such reason tions were not answered on the questionnaire; absent from school) presen to report for the survey; present in school but failed to return the qu the survey, the surveyor discussed the study carefully with the respond tions, reassured them of their right of non-cooperation in any manner, anonymity. The author, in a private communication, has elaborated on th the anonymity of the respondents. There is no doubt that the students not be identified with their answer sheets.

Included in the survey were data on those respondents who had never upon which the study was based and those who fell into the "no response" category was generally one percent or less of the respondents for each

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Usage	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	MDA	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Codeine	Opi
						Percentage of Respondents							
Students in six senior high schools in the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. (Date not given)	East North Central	City (717,000)	Questionnaire	6,041	Once	5.1	2.1	1.2	2.8	3.0	0.9	1.6	1.
					Occasional	5.6	2.5	0.8	3.2	2.5	0.7	1.2	1.
					Often	3.6	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.
					Regular	4.3	0.8	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.
					Total	18.6	6.4	2.5	7.6	6.6	2.0	3.2	4.

REFERENCE

Jackson, Basil; Lange, Robert W.; and Lehman, Robert P., "Teenage Drug Abuse in Middle Class Milwaukee". Wisconsin Medical Journal, Vol. 71, pp. 210-212, September 1972.

NOTES

The usage categories cited above are defined in the paper as follows

Occasional: once a month or less frequently,
Often: at least twice a month, but not weekly,
Regular: at least once a week.

As a result of its being more restricted than originally planned, this s drug picture in the entire metropolitan area of Milwaukee, but pertains middle and upper middle class at the time of the survey. Anonymity of t served, and checks were made on the reliability and validity of the resu

Item No. 50

Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents			Percentage of Respondents															
					Marijuana		Hallucinogens		Amphetamines		Cocaine		Barbiturates		Sedatives and Tranquilizers		Narcotics		Inhalants	
		M*	F*		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
City and County (555,700)	Verbal instruction and simultaneous screen presentation made by surveyor and questionnaire for recording of answers by students	365	378	Ever Used:																
		363	365	Freshmen	7.6	3.4	4.9	2.1	9.8	7.4	2.6	0.6	5.7	3.4	17.8	16.1	7.7	7.1	14.7	10.5
		329	299	Sophomores	14.6	9.0	7.1	5.6	11.3	12.3	2.4	1.9	8.5	9.0	19.1	25.2	9.7	9.9	18.7	10.2
		285	299	Juniors	20.1	9.3	8.8	3.7	13.9	14.1	1.8	1.0	7.9	11.4	20.3	34.1	8.8	10.6	13.6	7.4
				Seniors	24.9	12.1	7.1	2.0	14.0	13.1	3.9	0.7	9.5	7.7	22.5	29.1	9.5	6.3	12.3	2.0
				Frequency of use:																
				1-5 times:																
				Freshmen	3.0	2.6	3.8	1.3	6.6	5.8	1.6	0.3	4.4	2.9	14.0	12.5	5.5	5.8	9.0	8.2
				Sophomores	10.2	3.0	5.5	4.6	6.6	7.4	1.6	1.4	6.3	6.8	15.2	20.0	6.9	7.4	12.1	8.3
				Juniors	8.8	4.3	5.2	3.0	8.2	11.4	1.5	1.0	6.1	9.4	17.0	26.8	6.7	9.0	11.2	6.7
				Seniors	13.3	7.4	4.6	1.0	9.1	8.4	2.8	0.7	6.0	5.0	16.8	21.4	5.6	5.0	8.0	2.0
				6-15 times:																
				Freshmen	3.0	0.3	0.8	0.0	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.7	1.8	1.9	0.5	1.6	1.3
				Sophomores	1.4	2.7	0.0	0.5	3.1	2.2	0.0	0.5	1.4	1.1	2.5	2.7	1.4	1.4	2.5	1.4
				Juniors	5.8	1.0	1.5	0.7	3.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.0	2.4	5.3	1.2	1.3	0.9	0.0
				Seniors	4.9	1.7	1.8	0.7	2.1	3.0	0.7	0.0	1.4	2.0	3.2	3.7	2.5	1.0	2.5	0.0
				16+ times:																
				Freshmen	1.6	0.5	0.3	0.8	1.6	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.5	1.1	1.8	0.3	0.8	4.1	1.0
				Sophomores	3.0	3.3	1.6	0.5	1.6	2.7	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.1	1.4	2.5	1.4	1.1	4.1	0.5
				Juniors	5.5	4.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.6	1.0	0.9	2.0	0.9	0.3	1.5	0.7
				Seniors	6.7	3.0	0.7	0.3	2.8	1.7	0.4	0.0	2.1	0.7	2.5	4.0	1.4	0.3	1.8	0.0

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

John H.; Scheble, Robert; Wine, Richard L.; and Weitman, Morris, Use I -- Sex and Grade Di[illegible]". American Journal of Public 2418-2432, December 19[illegible].

NOTES

A systematic 10 percent sample (total size: 3,476) was drawn from the names on rosters of the community's 18 public high schools. It should be noted that the data cited above were based on the responses of 2,683, or 77.2 percent of the total sample. Of the remaining 793, there were 69 who failed to identify their sex and/or grade and were therefore excluded from the data analysis. The balance of 724 were discarded from the data analysis for such reasons as: four or more questions were not answered on the questionnaire; absent from school; present in school but failed to report for the survey; present in school but failed to return the questionnaire. In conducting the survey, the surveyor discussed the study carefully with the respondents, answered their questions, reassured them of their right of non-cooperation in any manner, and guaranteed them full anonymity. The author, in a private communication, has elaborated on the steps taken to assure the anonymity of the respondents. There is no doubt that the students were aware that they could not be identified with their answer sheets.

Included in the survey were data on those respondents who had never used any of the substances upon which the study was based and those who fell into the "no response" category. The "no response" category was generally one percent or less of the respondents for each classification of drug use.

Item No. 51

[illegible]og. [illegible]gion	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Usage	Percentage of Respondents										
					Marijuana	Hallucinogens	MDA	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Codeine	Opium	Hard Narcotics	Catnip	Glue
[illegible]st [illegible]rth [illegible]nt[illegible]al	City (717,000)	Questionnaire	6,041	Once	5.1	2.1	1.2	2.8	3.0	0.9	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.4	2.3
				Occasional	5.6	2.5	0.8	3.2	2.[illegible]	0.7	1.2	1.8	0.7	0.4	0.6
				Often	3.6	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2
				Regular	4.3	0.8	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4
				Total	18.6	6.4	2.5	7.6	6.6	2.0	3.2	4.4	2.2	2.1	3.5

[illegible]rt W.; and Lehman, Robert P., "Teenage Drug Abuse in Middle [illegible]n Medical Journal, Vol. 71, pp. 210-212, September 1972.

NOTES

The usage categories cited above are defined in the paper as follows:

Occasional: once a month or less frequently,
Often: at least twice a month, but not weekly,
Regular: at least once a week.

As a result of its being more restricted than originally planned, this survey does not portray the drug picture in the entire metropolitan area of Milwaukee, but pertains to the picture in the middle and upper middle class at the time of the survey. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved, and checks were made on the reliability and validity of the results.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students in Grades 5 and 6 in Alief Independent School District in Harris County, Texas. (Date not given)	West South Central	Suburban	19-item self-admin. questionnaire	124

	Percentage of Respondents							
	Marijuana		LSD		Pills		Sol	
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	
Ever Used								
Gr. 5	4.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	12.5	8.8	24.0	
Gr. 6	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	9.7	11.7	19.5	
Overall	2.4		1.6		9.8		21	

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

REFERENCE

Hays, J. Ray and Winburn, Michael G., "Drug Abuse Among Elementary School Students in a Suburban School Setting". Journal of Drug Education, Vol.2, No. 4, pp. 355-360, Winter 1972.

NOTES

These data are presented by the authors as preliminary results of a ing whether there should be a further investigation of drug use in ele cluster sample of fifth and sixth grade homerooms was used. The items together with a summary of the responses, are given in the paper. Bec sampling procedure and administration of the survey instrument by the percentages cannot be extrapolated to the elementary school population whole. Precautions were taken to ensure the anonymity of each student that they could not be identified individually. "Pills" (authors' ter category representing the medication with which young people first com No details were given regarding what was included in the categories of

---

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Student body in Natick High School and one Junior High School, Natick, Massachusetts (Year not stated)	New England	City (31,000)	Questionnaire	250

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Narcotics Heroin	Narcotics Other
Ever Used	34	8	10	9	2	6
Gr. 12						
Gr. 11						
Gr. 10						
Gr. 9						
Now Using	22	6	6	6	1	2

REFERENCE

Gelineau, Victor A.; Pearsall, Doris T.; Camp, Joy M.; and Zaks, Linda A., Report of the Natick Youth Study: A Profile of Students Grades Nine Through Twelve. Mimeo, 12 p., Division of Drug Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, April 1972.

NOTES

The above is a compilation of the quantitative information on drug The category "Ever Used" refers to any use during the previous year. N the selection of the sample, except the statement that it was a scienti sample comprising ten percent of the student body. The authors state t proven in seven other studies and is being employed in a statewide stud itself is not given in the report. Anonymity of the respondents was pr

---

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Users
All students in three homeroom classes (Grades 9, 11-12) and in one special class of 12th graders in a high school north of New Haven, Connecticut. (Date not given)	Northeast	Suburban	Self-admin. questionnaire	68	Sample A (homerooms):
				13	Sample S (special class):

	Percentage of Respondents						
	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Methedrine	Other Amphet.	Tranquilizers	Hero
Sample A	22.1	1.5	4.4	4.4	7.4	5.9	
Sample S	92.3	46.2		69.2	38.5	30.8	15.

(Figures for Sample S reflect the fact that most of the drug takers used

	Median Frequency of Use (Number of Times)	
	Marijuana	LSD	Methedrine or Amphetamines
Sample A	12	1	2
Sample S	200	10	70

(These data pertain to drug users, not to the whole samples.)

REFERENCE

Matchett, William Foster, "Who Use Drugs? A Study in a Suburban Public High School". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, No. 2, pp. 90-93, February 1971.

NOTES

The students in Sample A were considered by the author to be "averag Sample S were identified by the author as having good native academic a achievement. The author made every effort to safeguard the students' p format of the questionnaire and its method of administration, and in hi the students remain anonymous to him.

Item No. 52

Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
West South Central	Suburban	19-item self-admin. questionnaire	124

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana		LSD		Pills		Solvents	
	M*	F*	M	F	M	F	M	F
Ever Used								
Gr. 5	4.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	12.5	8.8	24.0	24.2
Gr. 6	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	9.7	11.7	19.5	29.4
Overall	2.4		1.6		9.8		23.8	

* M denotes Male respondents.
F denotes Female respondents.

Michael G., "Drug Abuse Among Elementary chool Students in a Journal of Drug Education, Vol.2, No. 4, pp. 355-360, Winter 1972.

NOTES

These data are presented by the authors as preliminary results of a pilot study for determining whether there should be a further investigation of drug use in elementary schools. A random cluster sample of fifth and sixth grade homerooms was used. The items on the questionnaire, together with a summary of the responses, are given in the paper. Because of the sample size, sampling procedure and administration of the survey instrument by the classroom teacher, the percentages cannot be extrapolated to the elementary school population of Harris County as a whole. Precautions were taken to ensure the anonymity of each student and to assure the students that they could not be identified individually. "Pills" (authors' terminology) is a generic category representing the medication with which young people first come in contact in the home. No details were given regarding what was included in the categories of "solvents" or "pills".

Item No. 53

Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
New England	City (31,000)	Questionnaire	250

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Narcotics: Heroin	Narcotics: Other	Cocaine	Glue	Any Drug
Ever Used	34	8	10	9	2	6	4	4	36
Gr. 12									45
Gr. 11									34
Gr. 10									35
Gr. 9									30
Now Using	22	6	6	6	1	2	2	2	24

ll, Doris T.; Camp, Joy M.; and Zaks, Linda A., Report of the file of Students Grades Nine Through Twelve. Mimeo, 12 p., tion, Department of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts,

NOTES

The above is a compilation of the quantitative information on drug use found in this report. The category "Ever Used" refers to any use during the previous year. No information is given on the selection of the sample, except the statement that it was a scientifically designed random sample comprising ten percent of the student body. The authors state that the questionnaire was proven in seven other studies and is being employed in a statewide study. The questionnaire itself is not given in the report. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved.

Item No. 54

	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Users
st	Suburban	Self-admin. questionnaire	68	Sample A (homerooms):
			13	Sample S (special class):

Percentage of Respondents

Users	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Methedrine	Other Amphet.	Tranquilizers	Heroin	Glue	Unspec. Other
Sample A (homerooms):	22.1	1.5	4.4	4.4	7.4	5.9		1.5	2.9
Sample S (special class):	92.3	46.2		69.2	38.5	30.8	15.4	15.4	

(Figures for Sample S reflect the fact that most of the drug takers used a variety of drugs.)

Median Frequency of Use (Number of Times)

	Marijuana	LSD	Methedrine or Amphetamines
Sample A	12	1	2
Sample S	200	10	70

(These data pertain to drug users, not to the whole samples.)

o Use Drugs? A Study in a Suburban Public High School". The , XLI, No. 2, pp. 90-93, February 1971.

NOTES

The students in Sample A were considered by the author to be "average", while those in Sample S were identified by the author as having good native academic ability but low academic achievement. The author made every effort to safeguard the students' privacy both in the format of the questionnaire and its method of administration, and in his insistence that the students remain anonymous to him.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
High school students in a small Mississippi community (Date not given)	South	Group-admin. questionnaire	458

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Tranquilizers	Opiates	Glue
Ever Used	9	1	7	5	0	

REFERENCE

Globetti, Gerald and Brigance, Roy S., "The Use and Nonuse of Drugs Among High School Students in a Small Rural Community." Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 317-322, December 1971.

NOTES

Cited above are the principal data on the use of drugs found in this paper. Several
black and white students are noted. Effects of family variables and religion are discus

The sample was chosen randomly from students in grades nine through twelve. Question
to groups of 25, and complete anonymity of the respondents was assured.

Item No. 55

Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Group-admin. questionnaire	458

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Tranquilizers	Opiates	Glue Sniffing
Ever Used	9	1	7	5	0	12

NOTES

Cited above are the principal data on the use of drugs found in this paper. Several differences between black and white students are noted. Effects of family variables and religion are discussed.

The sample was chosen randomly from students in grades nine through twelve. Questionnaires were administered to groups of 25, and complete anonymity of the respondents was assured.

e, Roy S., "The Use and
chool Students in a
rnal of Drug Education,
December 1971.

APPENDIX C

ABSTRACTS

SURVEYS OF UNIVERSITY POPULATIONS

ITEM NOS. 56-73

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Several classes of students attending a lecture course in "deviance and delinquency" at a state-supported university February 1970 May 1971	Mid-Atlantic	Self-admin. questionnaire	1970: 565 1971: 400

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	DMT or DET	Amphetamines	Methedrine	Barbiturates
Ever Trying 1970	72	23	4	29	9	14
Trying During Six-Month Period						
1970	70	18	1	21	5	9
1971	79	32	4	26	8	19

REFERENCE

Goode, Erich, "Trends in College Drug Use: Report From One Campus." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 123-127, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Table 2 in this paper. The six-month period refers to the survey. The data for marijuana are broken down by several categories of frequency of use in Since the same students were not involved in the two surveys (1970 and 1971), the data are, as th exploratory in nature rather than definitive.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
All 589 law students and 359 medical students attending Yale University in Fall 1970.	Northeast	Mail questionnaire	221 188

Percentage

Ever Used	Marijuana	LS
Law Students	73.3	6.
Medical Students	68.1	9.

REFERENCE

Slaby, Andrew E.; Lieb, Julian; and Schwartz, Arthur H., "Comparative Study of the Psychosocial Correlates of Drug Us Among Medical and Law Students." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 47, No. 9, pp. 717-723, September 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on in found in this paper. It is reporte LSD or amphetamines had also used m percent of both groups had used mar times. Only 5 students in the entir more than 10 times. The chief conc with psychosocial correlates of dru religious, social and professional

Item No. 56

...on	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents								
				Marijuana	LSD	DMT or DET	Amphetamines	Methedrine	Barbiturates	Cocaine	Opium	Heroin
...ntic	Self-admin. questionnaire	1970: 565 1971: 400	Ever Trying 1970	72	23	4	29	9	14	8	9	4
			Trying During Six-Month Period									
			1970	70	18	1	21	5	9	4	5	3
			1971	79	32	4	26	8	19	15	11	4

...ollege Drug Use: Report From
...of the First International
Surveys, Newark, New Jersey,
123-127, published, 1972 by
, 43 Central Drive,
35.

NOTES

The data tabulated above are found in Table 2 in this paper. The six-month period refers to the six-months prior to the survey. The data for marijuana are broken down by several categories of frequency of use in Table 1 in the paper. Since the same students were not involved in the two surveys (1970 and 1971), the data are, as the author has stated, exploratory in nature rather than definitive.

Item No. 57

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
All 589 law students and 359 medical students attending Yale University in Fall 1970.	Northeast	Mail questionnaire	221 188

Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents		
	Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines
Law Students	73.3	6.8	7.7
Medical Students	68.1	9.5	7.0

REFERENCE

Slaby, Andrew E.; Lieb, Julian; and Schwartz, Arthur H., "Comparative Study of the Psychosocial Correlates of Drug Use Among Medical and Law Students." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 47, No. 9, pp. 717-723, September 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on incidence of drug use found in this paper. It is reported that every user of LSD or amphetamines had also used marijuana. Over 35 percent of both groups had used marijuana more than 10 times. Only 5 students in the entire sample had used LSD more than 10 times. The chief concern in this paper is with psychosocial correlates of drug use (political, religious, social and professional attitudes and practices).

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	University	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline	DMT	MDA	Airplane Glue	Morning Glory Seeds	Synth. THC	Nutmeg	Barbit.	Tranq.	Amphet.	Ste
Undergraduate students in health education classes at five universities. Fall 1970	Questionnaire	201	Arizona State	49	5	10	1	1	1	1	4	<1	15	6	20	2
		200	Penn State	38	9	11	1	1	1	1	1	2	12	11	28	<1
		220	Univ. of Tenn.	33	6	7	1	2	<1	2	3	2	9	8	32	1
		178	Northern Colorado U.	37	11	12	2	2	4	2	2	7	8	4	6	2
		132	N.Y. State U. Geneseo	28	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	6	7	12	1

REFERENCE

Toohey, Jack V., "An Analysis of Drug Use Behavior at Five American Universities". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, No. 9, pp. 464-468, November 1971.

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to percentages of students who hav time. Also given in the paper are data on frequency of marijuana use marijuana. No details are given on the questionnaire or the way in wh

---

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Students at four medical schools in different geographic regions. Spring 1970.	West Coast Midwest Eastern Seaboard	Mail questionnaire	1,063

Percentage of Respondents	School A (N=213)	School B (N=226)	Sc (N
Have used marijuana in the past	70	17	
Using marijuana currently	44	6	
Present during marijuana use	85	35	
Present during marijuana use but abstained	15	19	
Never used it	30	84	
Never exposed to it	15	65	

REFERENCES

[1] Lipp, Martin R.; Benson, Samuel G.; and Taintor, Zebulon, "Marijuana Use by Medical Students". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 128, No. 2, pp. 207-212, August 1971.

[2] Lipp, Martin; Tinklenberg, Jared; Benson, Samuel; Melges, Frederick; Taintor, Zebulon; and Peterson, Margaret, "Medical Student Use of Marijuana, Alcohol, and Cigarettes: A Study of Four Schools". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 141-152, 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use and exposure to two papers, which are based on the same study. Respondents were stri schools are not identified. The overall rate of return of questionna between schools from a low of 57 percent to a high of 65 percent. Ot medical opinions concerning marijuana and the relationship of those valued sources of information on marijuana, and projected future use [2] are data on use of alcohol and cigarettes. A significant part of summarized by the statement: "If medical authorities can't convince marijuana is 'a dangerous drug', then persuading the population at la

---

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Sizes
Students who registered for the first time at the University of Minnesota in the fall of 1967--minus dropouts plus transfer students--as the group progressed through four years at the university. 1967-1970.	North Central	Questionnaire	1967: 4,183 1968: 2,496 1969: 1,128 1970: 2,517

Percentage of Respondents: Nonmedical Use of Drugs	1967 Freshmen		1968 Sophomores		1969 Juniors	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Current users	3.1	2.6	8.6	7.1	14.2	9.5
Ex users	5.9	3.9	16.1	15.3	19.9	19.8
Ever used	7.9		23.6		32.1	

REFERENCE

Dvorak, Edward J., "A Longitudinal Study of Nonmedical Drug Use Among University Students--A Brief Summary". Journal of the American College Health Association, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 212-215, February 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the incidence of nonmedical drug use p this paper. The reference "nonmedical use" is to one or more of such d barbiturates, and amphetamines. Data are not tabulated separately for a brief discussion of trends which were observed (decreasing use of LSD use of peyote and the hard narcotics). The surveys were based on syste effort was made to insure anonymity and confidentiality. A special fea longitudinal nature, and particularly notable is the trend of increasin years.

Item No. 58

lection hnique	Sample Size	University	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline	DMT	MDA	Airplane Glue	Morning Glory Seeds	Synth. THC	Nutmeg	Barbit.	Tranq.	Amphet.	Steroids	Cocaine	Morphine	Heroin
tionnaire	201	Arizona State	49	[illegible]	10	1	1	1	1	4	<1	15	6	20	2	2	1	1
	200	Penn State	38	9	11	1	1	1	1	1	2	12	11	28	<1	3	2	2
	220	Univ. of Tenn.	33	6	7	1	2	<1	2	3	2	9	8	32	-	2	1	1
	178	Northern Colorado U.	37	11	12	2	2	4	2	2	7	8	4	6	2	4	1	1
	132	N.Y. State U. Geneseo	28	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	6	7	12	-	-	1	1

lysis of Drug Use Behavior at Five American Universities". The Vol. XLI, No. 9, pp. 464-468, November 1971.

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to percentages of students who have used the drug at least one time. Also given in the paper are data on frequency of marijuana use among students that use marijuana. No details are given on the questionnaire or the way in which it was administered.

Item No. 59

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
West Coast	Mail questionnaire	1,063
Midwest		
Eastern Seaboard		

	Percentage of Respondents: School A (N=213)	School B (N=226)	School C (N=367)	School D (N=251)	Total (N=1057)
Have used marijuana in the past	70	17	68	46	50
Using marijuana currently	44	6	42	26	30
Present during marijuana use	85	35	88	74	70
Present during marijuana use but abstained	15	19	20	28	21
Never used it	30	84	32	54	50
Never exposed to it	15	65	12	26	30

nson, Samuel G.; and Taintor, Zebulon, "Marijuana Use by Medical rnal of Psychiatry, Vol. 128, No. 2, pp. 207-212, August 1971.

enberg, Jared, Benson, Samuel; Melges, Frederick; Taintor, Zebulon; "Medical Student Use of Marijuana, Alcohol, and Cigarettes: A The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 7, No. 1,

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use and exposure to marijuana use found in these two papers, which are based on the same study. Respondents were strictly anonymous, and the schools are not identified. The overall rate of return of questionnaires was 62 percent, vary between schools from a low of 57 percent to a high of 65 percent. Other topics surveyed include medical opinions concerning marijuana and the relationship of those opinions to marijuana use, valued sources of information on marijuana, and projected future use of marijuana. Included in [2] are data on use of alcohol and cigarettes. A significant part of the discussion in [1] is summarized by the statement: "If medical authorities can't convince medical students that marijuana is 'a dangerous drug', then persuading the population at large seems unlikely."

Item No. 60

	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Sizes
for the first	North Central	Questionnaire	1967: 4,183
f Minnesota			1968: 2,496
us dropouts			1969: 1,128
as the group			1970: 2,517
years at the			

	Percentage of Respondents: Nonmedical Use of Drugs: 1967 Freshmen Males	1967 Freshmen Females	1968 Sophomores Males	1968 Sophomores Females	1969 Juniors Males	1969 Juniors Females	1970 Seniors Males	1970 Seniors Females
Current users	3.1	2.6	8.6	7.1	14.2	9.5	20.3	18.5
Ex users	5.9	3.9	16.1	15.3	19.9	19.8	25.0	27.9
Ever used	7.9		23.6		32.1		45.8	

ngitudinal Study of Nonmedical Drug Use Among University Students-- nal of the American College Health Association, Vol. 20, No. 3, 972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on the incidence of nonmedical drug use presented in Figure 1 in this paper. The reference "nonmedical use" is to one or more of such drugs as marijuana, LSD, barbiturates, and amphetamines. Data are not tabulated separately for these drugs, but there is a brief discussion of trends which were observed (decreasing use of LSD and amphetamines, increasing use of peyote and the hard narcotics). The surveys were based on systematic samples, and every effort was made to insure anonymity and confidentiality. A special feature of this study is its longitudinal nature, and particularly notable is the trend of increasing incidence over the four years.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Sizes
Freshmen at the University of Houston, Texas (U.H.). Freshmen at the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia (U.Ga.). 1970.	West South Central South Atl.	Metropolitan (1,678,000) Small City (44,000)	Social Attitude Questionnaire	481 (U.H.) 470 (U.Ga.)

* significant at the .05 level of confidence
** significant at the .02 level of confidence
*** significant at the .01 level of confidence

	Percentage o U.H.
Have used drugs - am still using them	9
Have used drugs - might use them again	11
Have used drugs - not using them again	9
Have not used drugs - might try them	8
Have not used drugs - not going to use them	63
How often do you use drugs?	
not at all	78
once a month or less	7
twice a month	4
once a week	4
twice a week or more	5
Not used barbiturates in last 6 months	92
Used marijuana 10 or more times in last 6 months	13
Not used LSD in last 6 months	91
Not used opiates in last 6 months	96
Not used stimulants in the last 6 months	86
First used drugs at age 16 or younger	15

REFERENCE

Boardman, William K., "Comparison of Drug Attitudes of College Freshmen: Metropolitan Area Vs. University Community Setting". 10 p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern Psychological Association Convention, San Antonio, Texas, April 29 - May 1, 1971. (ED 051 535).

NOTES

Cited above are the data pertaining to the use of drugs found Item Nos. 27, 33, 52, 55, 56, 58, 59, and 63). The respondents we to be representative of freshmen at the two universities and to be terms of demographic and social characteristics. Anonymity of the The main concern of the study was the comparison of the responses Questionnaire between the two groups, one in a metropolitan envir small isolated community. The findings do not suggest a direct re use reported by freshmen and their location.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Undergraduate students at a large private residential university in the western U.S. Spring 1969.	Interview and questionnaire	Males: 150 Females: 51 Total: 201

	Percentage of Respond Marijuana		
Usage	Males	Females	Total
One or more times			
Freshmen	60	47	56
Sophomores	75	73	75
Juniors	78	54	71
Seniors	79	80	80
Total	72	61	69
Comparative data			
1968			57
1966-67			21

REFERENCE

Garfield, Emily F.; Boreing, Michael L.; and Smith, Jean Paul, "Marijuana Use on a Campus: Spring, 1969". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 487-491, September 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in thi responding "yes" to the question: "Have you ever tried LSD?" A graduates was drawn from the registrar's list. The response rat resulting sample of 201 constituted 3.4 percent of the populatio up study at the same university, thus providing an opportunity t (see comparative data cited above). The paper includes some dat use, reasons for terminating marijuana use, and career indecisio

Item No. 61

	Geog. Region	Community Type (Pop.)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Sizes
ity	West South	Metropolitan	Social	481 (U.H.)
).	Central	(1,678,000)	Attitude	
ity	South Atl.	Small City	Questionnaire	470 (U.Ga.)
rgia		(44,000)		

* significant at the .05 level of confidence
** significant at the .02 level of confidence
*** significant at the .01 level of confidence

	Percentage of Respondents	
	U.H.	U.Ga.
Have used drugs - am still using them	9	15*
Have used drugs - might use them again	11	17***
Have used drugs - not using them again	9	5
Have not used drugs - might try them	8	8
Have not used drugs - not going to use them	63	55***
How often do you use drugs?		
not at all	78	70***
once a month or less	7	12
twice a month	4	6
once a week	4	6
twice a week or more	5	5
Not used barbiturates in last 6 months	92	92
Used marijuana 10 or more times in last 6 months	13	19*
Not used LSD in last 6 months	91	96***
Not used opiates in last 6 months	96	98
Not used stimulants in the last 6 months	86	80***
First used drugs at age 16 or younger	15	9**

Comparison of Drug Attitudes of College Freshmen: Metropolitan
unity Setting". 10 p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern
n Convention, San Antonio, Texas, April 29 - May 1, 1971.

NOTES

Cited above are the data pertaining to the use of drugs found in this report (Table 2, Item Nos. 27, 33, 52, 55, 56, 58, 59, and 63). The respondents were considered by the author to be representative of freshmen at the two universities and to be similar and homogeneous in terms of demographic and social characteristics. Anonymity of the individuals was preserved. The main concern of the study was the comparison of the responses on the Social Attitude Questionnaire between the two groups, one in a metropolitan environment, the other in a small isolated community. The findings do not suggest a direct relationship between drug use reported by freshmen and their location.

Item No. 62

	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
at a	Interview and	Males: 150
al	questionnaire	Females: 51
rn U.S.		Total: 201

	Percentage of Respondents			
	Marijuana			LSD
Usage	Males	Females	Total	
One or more times				
Freshmen	60	47	56	
Sophomores	75	73	75	
Juniors	78	54	71	
Seniors	79	80	80	
Total	72	61	69	7
Comparative data				
1968			57	
1966-67			21	

ing, Michael L.; and Smith, Jean Paul, "Marijuana Use on a Campus:
rnational Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 487-491,

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in this paper, plus the percentage responding "yes" to the question: "Have you ever tried LSD?" A random sample of 205 undergraduates was drawn from the registrar's list. The response rate was 98 percent and the resulting sample of 201 constituted 3.4 percent of the population. This was a second follow-up study at the same university, thus providing an opportunity to look at longitudinal data (see comparative data cited above). The paper includes some data on frequency of marijuana use, reasons for terminating marijuana use, and career indecision in relation to marijuana use.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Female graduate students in a residence at Yale University April-May, 1969	New England	Interview	131

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Stimulants	Heroin
Current Users	16.8		6.9	
Former Users	11.4		26.0	
Tried Once	9.2			
Total Users	37.4	2.3	32.9	0.0

REFERENCE

Ford, Beryl I., "Illegal Drug Use in a Student Population." The Medical Journal of Australia, pp. 309-313, August 7, 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on extent of illegal drug use found in this paper. T term "stimulants" refers to "stimulant pills for slimming or staying awake".

The sample included graduate students who were under 30 years of age and had taken their undergraduate degrees in a wide variety of U. S. colleges. The eligible populatio consisted of 150 students. The data were collected in personal interviews in which the interviewer marked a precoded questionnaire. Confidentiality of the individual respond was maintained.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Student body at a coeducational, liberal arts, church-related college located in a central midwest community of 2500 population. Spring 1969.	51-item self-admin. questionnaire	239

Estimated Number of Times Used	Percentage of Re Marijua
Once or twice	11
Three to five times	4
Six to nine times	2
Ten to fourteen times	2
Fifteen to nineteen times	<1
Twenty times or more	6
Total	26

REFERENCE

McCain, Minta J.; Grupp, Stanley, E.; and Schmitt, Raymond L., "Marijuana Use in a Small College: A Midwest Example". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 463-485, September 1971.

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the from data given in Table 1 in the paper. A simple random sample of indicated population. The response rate was 79.7 percent and the f percent of the population. The questionnaire is appended to the pa of marijuana use are given. The discussion includes consideration acteristics of marijuana users as compared to those of non-users, p use, and response to student use of marijuana.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Class of Student	Degree of Use	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	O
College and graduate students of a middle Atlantic state University May 1969	Mid-Atl	220-item self-admin. question-naire	6,110	Under-graduate	Occasional	12.6	10.4	3.1	8.1	3.2	0.4	
					Regular	6.3	4.1	0.8	1.5	0.5	<0.1	
					Extreme	3.6	2.0	0.1	0.8	0.2	<0.1	
			922	Graduate	Occasional	24.2	14.3	2.7	9.9	3.9	*	
					Regular	8.2	2.0	0.0	1.7	0.4	*	
					Extreme	1.7	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	*	

Percentage of Respondents

*Insufficient quantity of data

REFERENCE

Anker, Jeffrey J.; Milman, Doris H.; Kahan, Stuart A.; and Valenti, Carlo, "Drug Usage and Related Patterns of Behavior in University Students: I. General Survey and Marihuana Use." Journal of the American College Health Association, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 178-186, February 1971.

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the t from data given in the paper. The questionnaire was administered to at the undergraduate schools, simultaneously on each of several camp population at each school was surveyed, about 20 percent of the grad veyed by mail. Appropriate steps were taken to preserve the anonymi The degrees of use cited above are defined in the paper as follows:

Occasional: once and once per month or less,
Regular: twice per month to twice per week, and
Extreme: more than twice per week.

Item No. 63

Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
duate	New England	Interview	131
n a			
at Yale			

1969

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana	LSD	Stimulants	Heroin
Current Users	16.8		6.9	
Former Users	11.4		26.0	
Tried Once	9.2			
Total Users	37.4	2.3	32.9	0.0

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on extent of illegal drug use found in this paper. The term "stimulants" refers to "stimulant pills for slimming or staying awake".

The sample included graduate students who were under 30 years of age and had taken their undergraduate degrees in a wide variety of U. S. colleges. The eligible population consisted of 150 students. The data were collected in personal interviews in which the interviewer marked a precoded questionnaire. Confidentiality of the individual respondents was maintained.

l I., "Illegal Drug Use in a Student ." The Medical Journal of Australia, 3, August 7, 1971.

Item No. 64

	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
ional,	51-item	239
d	self-admin.	
l	questionnaire	

Estimated Number of Times Used	Percentage of Respondents Marijuana
Once or twice	11
Three to five times	4
Six to nine times	2
Ten to fourteen times	2
Fifteen to nineteen times	<1
Twenty times or more	6
Total	26

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the total number of respondents, from data given in Table 1 in the paper. A simple random sample of 300 was drawn from the indicated population. The response rate was 79.7 percent and the final sample of 239 was 47.8 percent of the population. The questionnaire is appended to the paper. Some data on frequency of marijuana use are given. The discussion includes consideration of the personal-social characteristics of marijuana users as compared to those of non-users, perceived risks of marijuana use, and response to studen' use of marijuana.

anley, E.; and Schmitt, Raymond L., "Marijuana Use in a Small ". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1.

Item No. 65

n	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Class of Student	Degree of Use	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin	Opium	Cocaine	Glue
	220-item self-admin. question-naire	6,110	Under-graduate	Occasional	12.6	10.4	3.1	8.1	3.2	0.4	5.2	0.9	0.7
				Regular	6.3	4.1	0.8	1.5	0.5	<0.1	0.9	<0.1	<0.1
				Extreme	3.6	2.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	<0.1	0.3	<0.1	0.1
		922	Graduate	Occasional	24.2	14.3	2.7	9.9	3.9	*	2.1	*	*
				Regular	8.2	2.0	0.0	1.7	0.4	*	0.1	*	*
				Extreme	1.7	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	*	0.0	*	*

*Insufficient quantity of data

Percentage of Respondents

oris H.; Kahan, Stuart A.; and Valenti, Carlo, "Drug Usage vior in University Students: I. General Survey and Marihuana an College Health Association, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 178-186,

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the total number of respondents, from data given in the paper. The questionnaire was administered to randomly selected classes at the undergraduate schools, simultaneously on each of several campuses. The entire graduate population at each school was surveyed, about 20 percent of the graduate students being surveyed by mail. Appropriate steps were taken to preserve the anonymity of the respondents.

The degrees of use cited above are defined in the paper as follows:

Occasional: once and once per month or less,
Regular: twice per month to twice per week, and
Extreme: more than twice per week.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Percentage of Respondents Amphetamines
Female residents in the Auburn University women's dormitories, Fall Quarter, 1968.	East South Central	Urine samples analyzed by thin layer and gas chromatographic techniques	109 (A) 108 (B) 95 (C)	8.3 2.7 3.2

REFERENCE

Barber, Josephine M. and Means, Richard K. "Amphetamine Use Among College Women". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, no. 4, pp. 205-208, April 1971.

NOTES

One of the highlights of this study was the application of laborato data collection. The authors state that a stratified random sample was (N=120). Specimens were collected on three unannounced occasions: (A) of the quarter, (B) on a Monday ten days later, and (C) on a Friday dur examinations. Anonymity of the respondents was maintained. Time, ran ment variables were examined and differences were found to be statistic The authors indicate that because of the planned and unplanned limitati the paucity in the data, indication of trends was not advised.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Ever Used	Percentage of Respondents							
					Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Tranquilizers	Peyote	Ne
College students in the metropolitan area of Denver-Boulder, Colorado Fall 1968	Mountain	35-item mail questionnaire	26,111 974	Original Survey Follow-Up	26 33	6 9	4 <1	14 19	10 10	10 11	5 9	

REFERENCE

Barter, James T.; Mizner; George L.; and Werme, Paul H., Patterns of Drug Use Among College Students in the Denver-Boulder Metropolitan Area. An Epidemiological and Demographic Survey of Student Attitudes and Practices. SCID-TR-1, Final Report BNDD Contract No. J-68-51, Drug Control Division, Office of Scientific Support, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. 20537, September, 1971 (PB-205 002)

NOTES

Shown above are the basic data on the extent of illegal drug use found in this report. They are t tabulation of responses to items 17 and 35 on the questionnaire (Appendix B for the original survey, A the follow-up). The number for "Ever Used" in each drug type was taken as the total users over the va categories allowed in the questionnaire.

This is a very extensive report (311 pp.), in which drug use is analyzed in a wide variety of way terms of users of amphetamines, marijuana, or LSD (AML users).

Item No. 66

	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Percentage of Respondents Amphetamines
rn es,	East South Central	Urine samples analyzed by thin layer and gas chromatographic techniques	109 (A) 108 (B) 95 (C)	8.3 2.7 3.2

ns, Richard K., "Amphetamine Use Among College Women". The
l. XLI, No. 4, pp. 205-208, April 1971.

NOTES

One of the highlights of this study was the application of laboratory analysis procedure. n data collection. The authors state that a stratified random sample was drawn from the population (N=120). Specimens were collected on three unannounced occasions: (A) on a Friday near the first of the quarter, (B) on a Monday ten days later, and (C) on a Friday during the period of final examinations. Anonymity of the respondents was maintained. Time, rank, and school of enrollment variables were examined and differences were found to be statistically non-significant. The authors indicate that because of the planned and unplanned limitations of the study, including the paucity in the data, indication of trends was not advised.

Item No. 67

Percentage of Respondents

. on tain	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Ever Used	Marijuana	Hallucinogens LSD	Hallucinogens Other	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Tranquilizers	Peyote	Narcotics	Glue Sniffing
	35-item mail questionnaire	26,111	Original Survey	26	6	4	14	10	10	5	2	2
		974	Follow-Up	33	9	<1	19	10	11	9	2	2

eorge L.; and Werme, Paul H.,
College Students in the
Area. An Epidemiological
tudent Attitudes and Practices.
D Contract No. J-68-51, Drug
Scientific Support, Bureau of
gs, U. S. Department of Justice,
eptember, 1971 (PB-205 002)

NOTES

Shown above are the basic data on the extent of illegal drug use found in this report. They are taken from the tabulation of responses to items 17 and 35 on the questionnaire (Appendix B for the original survey, Appendix C for the follow-up). The number for "Ever Used" in each drug type was taken as the total users over the various use categories allowed in the questionnaire.

This is a very extensive report (311 pp.), in which drug use is analyzed in a wide variety of ways, mainly in terms of users of amphetamines, marijuana, or LSD (AML users).

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ethnicity	Extent of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Cannabis	LSD-Type Drugs	Amphetam
White student activists and nonwhite militants at a large U.S. university. 1968-1969 school year.	Not given	Questionnaire	20	White activists	Regular	25.0	-	*
					Frequent	30.0	15.0	*
					Occasional	5.0	30.0	*
					Total	60.0	45.0	65.0
			66	Nonwhite militants	Regular	9.1	1.5	*
					Frequent	22.7	-	*
					Occasional	15.2	4.6	*
					Total	47.0	6.1	14.0

* Breakdown not given

REFERENCE

Bailey, Walter C. and Koval, Mary, "Differential Patterns of Drug Abuse among White Activists and Nonwhite Militant College Students". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 191-199, 1972.

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the n (20 and 66 respectively) from figures given in this paper. Definitio the extent of use are:

Regular use: daily,
Frequent use: several times/week or once/week,
Occasional use: about once/month or less often than once/month

"Cannabis" includes marijuana and/or hashish. This was a pilot study intended to be representative of the college population. However, th fairly representative of white activists and nonwhite militants on a Comparison of these groups is th in thrust of the paper.

-63-

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Direct Experience with Marijuana	Percentage of Resp Marijuana
Students attending the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Feb. and Mar. 1968.	60-item mail questionnaire	666	Current users	7
			Past users	6
			Nonusers but with previous opportunity	20
			Nonusers and no previous opportunity	67

REFERENCE

Linn, Lawrence S., "Social Identification and the Use of Marijuana". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 79-107, March 1971.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on extent of use of marijuana found in this 1,000 names was drawn by computer from registration lists. A copy of the to the paper. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved. It is stated pleted questionnaires were returned, but the tabulations are based on a The main concern of this paper is examination of the relationship between vements college students have with their peers and their degree of experi

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens
Students enrolled at University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. Spring Quarter 1968.	North Central	66-item multiple-choice questionnaire	591	Ever Used	
				Age: ≤18	1.2
				19	4.1
				20	5.9
				21	5.1
				22	3.2
				23	1.0
				≥24	3.0
				Total	23.5

REFERENCE

Greenwald, H. S. and Luetgert, M. J., "A Comparison of Drug Users and Non-Users on an Urban Commuter College Campus". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 63-78, March 1971.

NOTES

The data cited above were inferred, as percentages of the total n (591), from figures given in Table 1 in the paper. Student participat voluntary and anonymous. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to t is defined as anyone who has ever tried any one of the hallucinogens. questionnaire (question 35), hallucinogens in the context of this surv hashish, LSD, mescaline, and peyote. The objective of the study was t the drug user on the urban college campus is identifiable in terms of are not shared by the non-using population.

Item No. 68

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Ethnicity	Extent of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Cannabis	LSD-Type Drugs	Amphetamines	Opiates
Not given	Questionnaire	20	White activists	Regular	25.0	-	*	-
				Frequent	30.0	15.0		5.0
				Occasional	5.0	30.0	*	35.0
				Total	60.0	45.0	65.0	40.0
		66	Nonwhite militants	Regular	9.1	1.5	*	3.0
				Frequent	22.7	-	*	4.5
				Occasional	15.2	4.6	*	4.5
				Total	47.0	6.1	14.0	12.0

* Breakdown not given

, Mary, "Differential Patterns of Drug Abuse among White
tant College Students". The International Journal of the
pp. 191-199, 1972.

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the numbers of respondents (20 and 66 respectively) from figures given in this paper. Definitions of terms describing the extent of use are:

Regular use: daily,
Frequent use: several times/week or once/week,
Occasional use: about once/month or less often than once/month or not regularly.

"Cannabis" includes marijuana and/or hashish. This was a pilot study, and the sample was not intended to be representative of the college population. However, the authors feel that it is fairly representative of white activists and nonwhite militants on a particular college campus. Comparison of these groups is the main thrust of the paper.

Item No. 69

	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Direct Experience with Marijuana	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana
ersity	60-item mail questionnaire	666	Current users	7
			Past users	6
			Nonusers but with previous opportunity	20
			Nonusers and no previous opportunity	67

Identification and the Use of Marijuana". The International
Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 79-107, March 1971.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on extent of use of marijuana found in this paper. A random sample of 1,000 names was drawn by computer from registration lists. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to the paper. Anonymity of the respondents was preserved. It is stated in the text that 704 completed questionnaires were returned, but the tabulations are based on a total of 666 respondents. The main concern of this paper is examination of the relationship between the types of social involvements college students have with their peers and their degree of experience with marijuana.

Item No. 70

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents: Hallucinogens
North Central	66-item multiple-choice questionnaire	591	Ever Used	
			Age: ≤18	1.2
			19	4.1
			20	5.9
			21	5.1
			22	3.2
			23	1.0
			≥24	3.0
			Total	23.5

t, M. J., "A Comparison of Drug Users and Non-Users on an Urban
he International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 1,

NOTES

The data cited above were inferred, as percentages of the total number of respondents (591), from figures given in Table 1 in the paper. Student participation in the survey was voluntary and anonymous. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to the paper. A drug user is defined as anyone who has ever tried any one of the hallucinogens. According to the questionnaire (question 31), hallucinogens in the context of this survey included marijuana, hashish, LSD, mescaline, and peyote. The objective of the study was to determine whether the drug user on the urban college campus is identifiable in terms of certain traits which are not shared by the non-using population.

111

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Marijuana			LSD	Mescaline	Percentage of Respondents Amphetamines	Tranquilizers	Sleeping Pills	Sedativ
Graduate students at a large state university in the southeastern U.S. (Date not given) [1]	Interview and questionnaire	169	Users	31			4	3	17			
				Men	Women	Overall						
			Never used marijuana	64	72	69						
			Discontinued use of marijuana	26	20	22						
			Continuing use of marijuana	10	8	9						
Women students at a large coeducational state university in the southeastern U.S (Date not given) [2]	Interview and questionnaire	184	Users	26			2	3	12	17	10	
			Used marijuana						24	26	17	
			Never used marijuana						6	13	11	
Undergraduates at a large coeducational state university in the southeastern U.S. (Date not given) [3]	Questionnaire	374	Users	36			10		22			14
				Men	Women	Overall						
			Experimented with marijuana	17	9	14	0		20			13
			Continued use of marijuana	38	29	35	28		50			24
			Never used marijuana	45	62	51			3			7

REFERENCES

[1] Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Graduate and Professional Students". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 129, No. 4, pp. 415-420, October 1972.

[2] Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Women College Students: Associated Risk-Taking and Coping Activities". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 130, No. 4, pp. 436-490, April 1973.

[3] Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Student Drug Use, Risk-Taking and Alienation". Mimeo, 12 p., presented at the American Psychiatric Association 1973 Annual Meeting, May 7-11, Honolulu, Hawaii. Journal of the American College Health Association, 1974 (in press).

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of drug use found in thes
figures are based on random samples from the indicated populations. The
pectively, 85 percent, 92 percent, and 83 percent. The term "Users" refe
reported taking the indicated drug at least once in the past year. Other
marijuana only. The students were separated in [1] by graduate group (he
academic women), but the numbers were so small that percentages were not
Other topics discussed in these papers include sources of drug informatio
of marijuana use, frequency of alcohol use by marijuana groups, experienc
various psycho-social and health aspects of drug use. Users and nonusers
pared in terms of their backgrounds, attitudes, risk-taking and desired e

Item No. 71

ata ollection chnique	Sample Size		Marijuana			LSD	Mescaline	Percentage of Respondents Amphetamines	Tranquilizers	Sleeping Pills	Sedatives	Heroin	Cocaine	Opium
				31		4	3	17					<1	<1
nterview and uestionnaire	169	Users	Men	Women	Overall									
		Never used marijuana	64	72	69									
		Discontinued use of marijuana	26	[illegible]	22									
		Continuing use of marijuana	10	8	9									
				26		2	3	12	17	10				
nterview and uestionnaire	184	Users						24	26	17				
		Used marijuana						6	13	11				
		Never used marijuana												
				36		10		22			14	1	[illegible]	5
uestionnaire	374	Users	Men	Women	Overall									
			17	9	14	0		20			13		0	0
		Experimented with marijuana	38	29	35	28		50			24	2	9	14
		Continued use of marijuana	45	62	51			3			7			
		Never used marijuana												

ing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Graduate and can Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 129, No. 4, pp. 415-420,

ing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Women College ing and Coping Activities". American Journal of Psychiatry, April 1973.

ing, John A., "Student Drug Use, Risk-Taking and Alienation". American Psychiatric Association 1973 Annual Meeting, Journal of the American College Health Association, 1974

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of drug use found in these three papers. All figures are based on random samples from the indicated populations. The response rates were, respectively, 85 percent, 92 percent, and 83 percent. The term "Users" refers to all students who reported taking the indicated drug at least once in the past year. Other breakdowns pertain to marijuana only. The students were separated in [1] by graduate group (health, law, academic men, academic women), but the numbers were so small that percentages were not calculated for the groups. Other topics discussed in these papers include sources of drug information, frequency and dosage of marijuana use, frequency of alcohol use by marijuana groups, experiences with marijuana, and various psycho-social and health aspects of drug use. Users and nonusers of marijuana were compared in terms of their backgrounds, attitudes, risk-taking and desired experiences.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Numb. of Respondents
178 students in college psychology courses (Date not given)	(not given)	Questionnaire	178 (91 males, 87 females)

	Percentage of Respondents Marijuana
Adamant nonusers	22
Nonusers	21
Tasters	24
Recreational users	15
Regular users	17

REFERENCE

Cross, Herbert J. and Davis, Gary L., "College Students' Adjustment and Frequency of Marijuana Use". Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 65-67, 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on five categories of marijuana users respondents were volunteers from psychology courses. Adamant nonus using a drug and state that drug use should be prohibited. Nonusers using a drug but have not actually done so. Tasters use marijuana Recreational users use marijuana from one to four times per month. more than once a week. The main concern in this paper is with malad the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank. Maladjustment scores and fr to be unrelated, although the very heaviest drug users were more mal

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Senior medical classes at one Canadian (Ontario) and one U.S. (California) university. (Date not given)	Questionnaire	Ontario: 149 California: 85

	Percentage of Res, ond
	Cannabis
Extent of Use	Ontario Sample
Never	57
Once or more (not in last 6 mo.)	16
Infrequently (in last 6 mo.)	14
About monthly	10
About weekly	2
About daily	1

REFERENCE

Solursh, Lionel P.; Weinstock, S. Joseph; Saunders, C. Scott; and Ungerleider, J. Thomas, "Attitudes of Medical Students Toward Cannabis". Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 217, No. 10, pp. 1371-1372, September 6, 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of cannabis u Cannabis was defined as "intended to include marijuana, hashish derived from the hemp plant". The Ontario class had an enroll present on the day the questionnaire was distributed, and 149 The California class had an enrollment of 113; 86 were present was distributed, and 85 responses were returned. The paper inc of use of caffeine, alcohol, and tobacco, and a discussion of toward cannabis use.

Item No. 72

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
(not given)	Questionnaire	178 (91 males, 87 females)

	Percentage of Respondents Marijuana
Adamant nonusers	22
Nonusers	21
Tasters	24
Recreational users	15
Regular users	17

s, Gary L., "College Students' Adjustment and Frequency of
f Counseling Psychology, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 65-67, 1972.

NOTES

Cited above are the data on five categories of marijuana users found in this paper. The respondents were volunteers from psychology courses. Adamant nonusers have never considered using a drug and state that drug use should be prohibited. Nonusers have seriously considered using a drug but have not actually done so. Tasters use marijuana less than once per month. Recreational users use marijuana from one to four times per month. Regular users use marijuana more than once a week. The main concern in this paper is with maladjustment, as measured by the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank. Maladjustment scores and frequency of use were found to be unrelated, although the very heaviest drug users were more maladjusted.

Item No. 73

	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
one U.S.	Questionnaire	Ontario: 149 California: 85

Extent of Use	Percentage of Respondents Cannabis Ontario Sample	Cannabis California Sample
Never	57	27
Once or more (not in last 6 mo.)	16	29
Infrequently (in last 6 mo.)	14	2
About monthly	10	23
About weekly	2	17
About daily	1	1

ock, S. Joseph; Saunders, C. Scott; and Ungerleider, J. Thomas,
ents Toward Cannabis". Journal of the American Medical
10, pp. 1371-1372, September 6, 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the extent of cannabis use found in this paper. Cannabis was defined as "intended to include marijuana, hashish, and related products derived from the hemp plant". The Ontario class had an enrollment of 185; 150 were present on the day the questionnaire was distributed, and 149 responses were returned. The California class had an enrollment of 113; 86 were present on the day the questionnaire was distributed, and 85 responses were returned. The paper includes data on the extent of use of caffeine, alcohol, and tobacco, and a discussion of attitudes of the students toward cannabis use.

APPENDIX D

ABSTRACTS
SURVEYS OF OTHER POPULATIONS
ITEM NOS. 74-98

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Residents of the state of South Carolina age 14 years and above. July 14-August 1, 1973.	South Atl.	Interview	2500

	Projected Percentage of Population				
	Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Psychotogens other than LSD	Methedrine/ Methamphetamine	Heroin
Never Used	91.1	97.4	97.1	97.5	98.2
Former User	3.6	1.0	1.2	0.9	0.2
User, Not Current	1.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.1
Current User	2.6	0.1	0.2	0.2	---
No Data	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.5
Regular Users					
Total	2.9	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1
Males: Total	2.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1
Age: 14-17	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1
18-24	1.5	<0.1	0.1	0.2	---
25-34	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	---
35-49	---	---	---	---	---
50 and over	---	---	---	---	---
Females: Total	0.6	---	<0.1	---	---
Age: 14-17	0.1	---	---	---	---
18-24	0.4	---	<0.1	---	---
25-34	0.1	---	---	---	---
35-49	---	---	---	---	---
50 and over	---	---	---	---	---
Male high school students	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Female high school students	0.2	---	---	---	---
Male college students	0.3	---	<0.1	<0.1	---
Female college students	0.1	---	<0.1	---	---
Males employed	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	---
Females employed	0.2	---	---	---	---
Males unemployed	0.3	0.1	---	---	---
Females unemployed	0.1	---	---	---	---
Black	0.4	---	---	---	---
White	2.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1
All other/No Data	---	---	---	---	---
Socioeconomic Status					
Upper or upper middle	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	---
Middle	2.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	<0.1
Lower	0.4	0.1	---	<0.1	---
No Data	0.1	---	---	---	---

REFERENCE

Chambers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; Siegal, Harvey A.; and Conway, William S., An Assessment of the Incidence and Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Use Within the General Population of the State of South Carolina. Resource Planning Corporation, Washington, D. C., Miami, Florida, and White Plains, New York, August 1973.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in this report. The pre
data are from Tables 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 63, and 67. Former users have not used the drug in
users, not current have used the drug during the past six months but not within the past 30 d
have used the drug during the past 30 days. Regular users include all current users, plus u
have used the drug on a daily basis.

The breakdown of regular users by demographic characteristics is based on data found in
60, 64, and 68 in the report. The figures cited above are percentages of the total base popu
whereas those in the report are percentages of the regular users in each drug category. All
rounded to the nearest tenth of one percent. Thus the notation "<0.1" denotes a result which
percent. Any failure of the percentages in the various categories to add precisely to the i
is due to rounding error.

The data cited above were obtained by quota sampling (rather than probability sampling).
possible to estimate the sampling error or to obtain confidence intervals for the indicated
state that the figures they have given for each drug type must be viewed as minimal projecti

Item No. 74

lation eyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
idents he e of th lina 14 s and e. 14- st 1,	South Atl.	Interview	2500

	Projected Percentage of Population						
	Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Psychotogens other than LSD	Methedrine/ Methamphetamine	Heroin	Cocaine	Solvents/ Inhalants
Never Used	91.1	97.4	97.1	97.5	98.2	96.8	98.5
Former User	3.6	1.0	1.2	0.9	0.2	1.3	0.3
User, Not Current	1.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.3	<0.1
Current User	2.6	0.1	0.2	0.2	---	<0.1	<0.1
No Data	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.5	1.6	1.2
Regular Users							
Total	2.9	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1	0.1	<0.1
Males: Total	2.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Age: 14-17	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	---	<0.1
18-24	1.5	<0.1	0.1	0.2	---	<0.1	---
25-34	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	---	---	---
35-49	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
50 and over	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Females: Total	0.6	---	<0.1	---	---	<0.1	---
Age: 14-17	0.1	---	---	---	---	<0.1	---
18-24	0.4	---	<0.1	---	---	<0.1	---
25-34	0.1	---	---	---	---	---	---
35-49	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
50 and over	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Male high school students	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	---	---
Female high school students	0.2	---	---	---	---	<0.1	---
Male college students	0.3	---	<0.1	<0.1	---	<0.1	---
Female college students	0.1	---	<0.1	---	---	---	---
Males employed	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	---	<0.1	<0.1
Females employed	0.2	---	---	---	---	<0.1	---
Males unemployed	0.3	0.1	---	---	---	---	---
Females unemployed	0.1	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black	0.4	---	---	---	---	<0.1	---
White	2.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1	0.1	<0.1
All other/No Data	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Socioeconomic Status							
Upper or upper middle	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	---	<0.1	---
Middle	2.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Lower	0.4	0.1	---	<0.1	---	---	---
No Data	0.1	---	---	---	---	---	---

ERENCE

mbers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; gal, Harvey A.; and Conway, William An Assessment of the Incidence Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Within the General Population of State of South Carolina. Resource nning Corporation, Washington, C., Miami, Florida, and White ins, New York, August 1973.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in this report. The prevalence and incidence data are from Tables 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 63, and 67. Former users have not used the drug in the past six months; users, not current have used the drug during the past six months but not within the past 30 days; and current users have used the drug during the past 30 days. Regular users include all current users, plus users, not current who have used the drug on a daily basis.

The breakdown of regular users by demographic characteristics is based on data found in Tables 44, 48, 52, 56, 60, 64, and 68 in the report. The figures cited above are percentages of the total base population (1,844,390), whereas those in the report are percentages of the regular users in each drug category. All results have been rounded to the nearest tenth of one percent. Thus the notation "<0.1" denotes a result which is less than 0.05 percent. Any failure of the percentages in the various categories to add precisely to the indicated category total is due to rounding error.

The data cited above were obtained by quota sampling (rather than probability sampling). Thus it is not possible to estimate the sampling error or to obtain confidence intervals for the indicated estimates. The authors state that the figures they have given for each drug type must be viewed as minimal projections.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique
General population 15 years of age or older. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Spring 1973.	Mid-Atl	Interview and Self-admin. questionnaire (Household Survey)

Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents				
	Marijuana	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Tranquilizers	"Pills"
No Use					
Stratum I	77.8	92.9	92.0	90.5	88.8
II	79.6	93.4	92.2	91.1	88.2
III	82.1	92.9	93.7	92.6	90.4
IV	83.1	92.0	92.6	92.1	89.5
Total Sample	80.8	92.7	92.7	91.7	89.4
1-11 times/year					
Stratum I	9.0	4.5	5.6	6.0	7.1
II	8.2	4.6	5.4	5.6	6.9
III	8.2	3.9	4.7	4.9	5.9
IV	5.0	4.5	5.4	6.2	6.9
Total Sample	7.6	4.3	5.2	5.6	6.6
1-8 times/month					
Stratum I	7.9	1.8	1.8	2.5	2.7
II	8.6	2.0	1.7	2.3	3.3
III	6.0	2.7	1.3	1.9	2.7
IV	7.6	2.8	1.6	1.6	3.1
Total Sample	7.3	2.4	1.6	2.0	2.9
3 or more times/week					
Stratum I	5.3	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.5
II	3.6	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.6
III	3.8	0.6	0.3	0.7	1.0
IV	4.3	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.5
Total Sample	4.3	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.1
95% Confidence Intervals on Dysfunctional Use					
Stratum I	3.7-6.9	0.1-1.3	0.0-1.2	0.3-1.8	0.6-2.4
II	1.3-5.9	*0.0-0.2	*0.0-1.8	*0.0-2.3	0.9-3.2
III	2.5-5.1	0.0-1.2	*0.0-0.7	0.1-1.3	0.3-1.7
IV	2.8-5.8	0.0-1.4	*0.0-0.9	*0.0-0.4	*0.0-1.1
Statewide Total	3.5-5.1	0.3-0.9	0.2-0.8	0.3-0.9	0.7-1.5
*Actual value negative					
3 or more times/week					
Age Group: 15-19					1.8
20-24					2.3
25-34					0.9
35-44					0.4
45-54					0.7
55 or over					0.6
Sex: Male					0.9
Female					1.1
Race: Black					1.4
White					1.0
Other					0.0

REFERENCE

Schaps, Eric and Rubin, Elliot L., A Study of Prevalence and Intensity of Drug and Alcohol Use in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, August 10, 1973.

NOTES

The above data by use categories and strata are found in Tables 9-14 in this report. The frequency of use "to get 'high'" on the indicated drug types (i.e., nonmedical use). Stratum residents of large urban areas; Stratum II: suburban residents; Stratum III: residents of sm towns; and Stratum IV: rural residents. The counties in each stratum are listed on page 7 in In the composite category of "pills", respondents were characterized according to the highest which they used one or more of the barbiturate, tranquilizer, or amphetamine drug types. Opia heroin, methadone, morphine, Demerol, etc. "No Use" means no use during the year prior to t who use a drug an average of three or more times per week are considered "abusers" of the drug data on confidence intervals for "abusers" by strata are found in Table 16 in the report. The "abusers" of "pills" and opiates by age group, sex, and race are found in Tables 17-22. These the corresponding data for the other frequencies of use; the latter are omitted from the above because of space limitations.

A total of 3,000 interviews (0.0341 percent of the State's population 15 years of age and conducted, but only 2,932 questionnaires were completed and returned in time for analysis. Of discarded because of suspected exaggeration (on the basis of responses to questions on a non-

Item No. 76

on Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Tranquilizers	"Pills"	Opiates
opulation of age or Common- nia. 973.	Mid-Atl	Interview and Self-admin. question-naire (Household Survey)	No Use						
			Stratum I	77.8	92.9	92.0	90.5	88.8	94.8
			II	79.6	93.4	92.2	91.1	88.2	94.5
			III	82.1	92.9	93.7	92.6	90.4	96.4
			IV	83.1	92.0	92.6	92.1	89.5	95.3
			Total Sample	80.8	92.7	92.7	91.7	89.4	95.7
			1-11 times/year						
			Stratum I	9.0	4.5	5.6	6.0	7.1	2.6
			II	8.2	4.6	5.4	5.6	6.9	3.6
			III	8.2	3.9	4.7	4.9	5.9	2.2
			IV	5.0	4.5	5.4	6.2	6.9	2.6
			Total Sample	7.6	4.3	5.2	5.6	6.6	2.6
			1-8 times/month						
			Stratum I	7.9	1.8	1.8	2.5	2.7	1.5
			II	8.6	2.0	1.7	2.3	3.3	1.0
			III	6.0	2.7	1.3	1.9	2.7	0.7
			IV	7.6	2.8	1.6	1.6	3.1	0.4
			Total Sample	7.5	2.4	1.6	2.0	2.9	0.9
			3 or more times/week						
			Stratum I	5.3	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.5	1.2
			II	3.6	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.6	1.0
			III	3.8	0.6	0.3	0.7	1.0	0.8
			IV	4.3	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.7
			Total Sample	4.3	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.1	0.9
			95% Confidence Intervals on Dysfunctional Use						
			Stratum I	3.7-6.9	0.1-1.3	0.0-1.2	0.3-1.8	0.6-2.4	0.4-2.0
			II	1.3-5.9	*0.0-0.2	*0.0-1.8	*0.0-2.3	0.0-3.2	*0.0-2.3
			III	2.5-5.1	0.0-1.2	*0.0-0.7	0.1-1.3	0.3-1.7	0.2-1.4
			IV	2.8-5.8	0.0-1.4	*0.0-0.9	*0.0-0.4	*0.0-1.1	0.0-1.4
			Statewide Total	3.5-5.1	0.3-0.9	0.2-0.8	0.3-0.9	0.7-1.5	0.5-1.3
			*Actual value negative						
			3 or more times/week						
			Age Group: 15-19					1.8	1.5
			20-24					2.3	1.4
			25-34					0.9	1.2
			35-44					0.4	0.2
			45-54					0.7	0.2
			55 or over					0.6	0.9
			Sex: Male					0.9	1.2
			Female					1.1	0.6
			Race: Black					1.4	1.4
			White					1.0	0.8
			Other					0.0	0.0

CE

Eric and Rubin, Elliot L., of Prevalence and Intensity and Alcohol Use in the ealth of Pennsylvania. r's Council on Drug and Abuse, Commonwealth of vania, Harrisburg, vania, August 10, 1973.

NOTES

The above data by use categories and strata are found in Tables 9-14 in this report. They pertain to frequency of use "to get 'high'" on the indicated drug types (i.e., nonmedical use). Stratum I includes residents of large urban areas; Stratum II: suburban residents; Stratum III: residents of small cities and towns; and Stratum IV: rural residents. The counties in each stratum are listed on page 7 in the report. In the composite category of "pills", respondents were characterized according to the highest frequency with which they used one or more of the barbiturate, tranquilizer, or amphetamine drug types. Opiates include heroin, methadone, morphine, Demerol, etc. "No Use" means no use during the year prior to the survey. Those who use a drug an average of three or more times per week are considered "abusers" of the drug. The above data on confidence intervals for "abusers" by strata are found in Table 16 in the report. The data on "abusers" of "pills" and opiates by age group, sex, and race are found in Tables 17-22. These tables give the corresponding data for the other frequencies of use; the latter are omitted from the above tabulation because of space limitations.

A total of 3,000 interviews (0.0341 percent of the State's population 15 years of age and older) were conducted, but only 2,932 questionnaires were completed and returned in time for analysis. Of these, 32 were discarded because of suspected exaggeration (on the basis of responses to questions on a non-existent drug).

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Projected Percentage of Population: Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Psychotogens other than LSD	Methedrine/ Methamphetamine	Heroin	Coc
Residents of the state of Minnesota age 14 years and above January 20-February 16, 1973.	West North Central	Interview	2500	Never Used	85.2	95.1	94.4	93.9	96.4	9
				Former User	5.0	1.7	2.0	2.3	0.4	
				User, Not Current	2.1	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.3	
				Current User	5.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.1	
				No Data	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.8	
				Regular Users						
				Total	5.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.1	
				Males	3.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1	
				Females	2.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	---	
				Male high school students	0.8	0.2	<0.1	0.1	0.1	
				Female high school students	0.7	---	0.1	0.2	---	
				Male college students	0.2	---	---	<0.1	---	
				Female college students	<0.1	---	---	---	---	
				Males employed	1.8	0.1	0.2	<0.1	---	
				Females employed	0.6	---	---	<0.1	---	
				Males unemployed	0.3	---	---	0.2	---	
				Females unemployed	0.9	0.1	---	---	---	
				Age: 14-17	1.6	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	
				18-24	2.9	<0.1	<0.1	0.2	---	
				25-34	0.6	0.1	0.1	---	---	
				35-49	0.5	---	---	---	---	
				50 and above	---	---	---	<0.1	---	
				Socioeconomic Status						
				Upper or upper middle	<0.1	---	<0.1	0.3	---	
				Middle	4.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	
				Lower	1.5	0.3	0.1	<0.1	---	

REFERENCE

Chambers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; and Siegal, Harvey A., An Assessment of the Incidence and Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Use Within the General Population of the State of Minnesota. Resource Planning Corporation, Washington, D. C. and Miami, Florida, April 1973.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in this report. The preval data are from Tables 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, 48, and 51. Former users have not used the drug in the users, not current have used the drug during the past six months but not within the past 30 days users have used the drug during the past 30 days. Regular users include all current users, plus who have used the drug on a daily basis.

The breakdown of regular users by demographic characteristics is based on data found in Tab 46, 49, and 52 in the report. The figures cited above are percentages of the total base populat whereas those in the report are percentages of the regular users in each drug category. All rea rounded to the nearest tenth of one percent. Thus the notation "<0.1" denotes a result which is percent. Any failure of the percentages in the various categories to add precisely to the indic is due to rounding error.

The data cited above were obtained by quota sampling (rather than probability sampling). T possible to estimate the sampling error or to obtain confidence intervals for the indicated esti state that the figures they have given for each drug type must be viewed as minimal projections.

Item No. 75

tion ved	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
ents e of ota 4 and ry 20– ary 16,	West North Central	Interview	2500

	Projected Percentage of Population						
	Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Psychotogens other than LSD	Methedrine/ Methamphetamine	Heroin	Cocaine	Solvents/ Inhalants
Never Used	85.2	95.1	94.4	93.9	96.4	93.7	95.7
Former User	5.0	1.7	2.0	2.3	0.4	1.6	1.2
User, Not Current	2.1	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.3	0.8	0.2
Current User	5.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.2
No Data	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.2	2.7
Regular Users							
Total	5.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.6	0.2
Males	3.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2
Females	2.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	---	0.3	---
Male high school students	0.8	0.2	<0.1	0.1	0.1	---	<0.1
Female high school students	0.7	---	0.1	0.2	---	---	---
Male college students	0.2	---	---	<0.1	---	<0.1	<0.1
Female college students	<0.1	---	---	---	---	---	---
Males employed	1.8	0.1	0.2	<0.1	---	0.2	0.2
Females employed	0.6	---	---	<0.1	---	---	---
Males unemployed	0.3	---	---	0.2	---	0.1	---
Females unemployed	0.9	0.1	---	---	---	0.3	---
Age: 14-17	1.6	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	---	<0.1
18-24	2.9	<0.1	<0.1	0.2	---	0.3	<0.1
25-34	0.6	0.1	0.1	---	---	0.1	0.1
35-49	0.5	---	---	---	---	---	---
50 and above	---	---	---	<0.1	---	0.2	---
Socioeconomic Status							
Upper or upper middle	<0.1	---	<0.1	0.3	---	0.2	<0.1
Middle	4.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2
Lower	1.5	0.3	0.1	<0.1	---	0.2	---

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on the use of illegal drugs found in this report. The prevalence and incidence data are from Tables 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, 48, and 51. Former users have not used the drug in the past six months; users, not current have used the drug during the past six months but not within the past 30 days; and current users have used the drug during the past 30 days. Regular users include all current users, plus users, not current who have used the drug on a daily basis.

The breakdown of regular users by demographic characteristics is based on data found in Tables 34, 37, 40, 43, 46, 49, and 52 in the report. The figures cited above are percentages of the total base population (1,909,500), whereas those in the report are percentages of the regular users in each drug category. All results have been rounded to the nearest tenth of one percent. Thus the notation "<0.1" denotes a result which is less than 0.05 percent. Any failure of the percentages in the various categories to add precisely to the indicated category total is due to rounding error.

The data cited above were obtained by quota sampling (rather than probability sampling). Thus it is not possible to estimate the sampling error or to obtain confidence intervals for the indicated estimates. The authors state that the figures they have given for each drug type must be viewed as minimal projections.

ENCE

ers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; Hegal, Harvey A., An Assessment e Incidence and Prevalence of and Alcohol Use Within the al Population of the State of sota. Resource Planning ration, Washington, D. C. and , Florida, April 1973.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique		Percentage of Respondents													
			Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Methamphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Meperi-dine	Hydro-morphone	Codeine	Cocaine	Morphine	Paregoric	Pey
1799 employees in 51 Federal agencies. March 1972.	80-item self-admin. questionnaire	Any use	9	1	10	2	3	2	7	2	6	2	2	4	
		6 times or more	3	<1	4	-	2	<1	2	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1
		25 times or more	2	<1	3	-	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1

REFERENCE

Hart, H. C., "Drug/Alcohol Survey. I: Usage Among a Group of Federal Employees". Nwsltr. Res. Psychol., Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 42-48, 1972.

NOTES

In March 1972 a drug/alcohol questionnaire was distributed to fif covering 5,639 employees. Scorable responses were received from 1,799 anonymity of individuals and agencies was preserved. Internal checks were built into the questionnaire. Cited above are the data on usage in the paper, which are based on the "second question" technique. The respondents tend to be weighted toward the higher educational and soci spectrum. He feels that the sample is representative of the entire gr chosen, but probably not of the general population.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique		Percentage of Respondents												
			Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Methamphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Meperi-dine	Hydro-morphone	Codeine	Cocaine	Morphine	Paregoric	Peyo
162 patients in a VA hospital August 1971.	80-item self-admin. questionnaire	Any use	13	4	7	2	4	5	9	3	5	3	-	8	
		6 times or more	4	<1	4	-	2	<1	3	<1	1	<1	-	2	<1

REFERENCE

Hart, H. C. and Blitch, J. W., "Drug/Alcohol Survey. II: Usage Among a Group of VA Patients". Nwsltr. Res. Psychol., Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 2-5, 1972.

NOTES

In August 1971 a drug/alcohol questionnaire was given to 680 pati Scorable responses were received from 162 patients. Complete anonymity preserved. Internal checks for accuracy and validity were built into above are the data on usage of drugs found in Table 1 in the paper, wh question" technique. The author states that the mean socio-economic l in the lower middle class.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
People of age 15 and over living in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. 1971.	South Atl.	City (133,000)	Interview	1,000

	Percentage of Re			
	Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline or Peyote	Amphe amin
Have tried it before or might try occasionally	5.2	0.6	1.1	6.3
Use when I feel like it	2.3	0.6	1.0	2.1
Use freely or have tried:				
Blacks	7.8	1.3	2.3	2.9
Whites	7.7	1.3	2.4	12.6

REFERENCE

Wake Forest University, Youth Services Bureau, A Study of the Knowledge and Attitudes of Winston-Salem Citizens Concerning Drug Use and Abuse. Mimeo, 46 p., Youth Services Bureau of Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, March 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on extent of use of drugs found in based on the responses of the first 1,000 interviewees out of a total the report, the figures for marijuana are broken down by age groups. a prominent part of this report, since, as the title indicates, the st with knowledge and attitudes.

Item No. 77

ata ollection echnique		Percentage of Respondents																	
		Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Methamphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Meperi-dine	Hydro-morphone	Codeine	Cocaine	Morphine	Paregoric	Peyote	STP	Meth-adone	Psilo-cybin	DMT	PCP
0-item	Any use	9	1	10	2	3	2	7	2	6	2	2	4	1	1	1	<1	<1	<1
lf-admin.	6 times or more	3	<1	4	-	2	<1	2	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
uestionnaire	25 times or more	2	<1	3	-	1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1

Survey. I: Usage Among a Group of Federal Employees". Nwsltr. . 1, pp. 42-48, 1972.

NOTES

In March 1972 a drug/alcohol questionnaire was distributed to fifty-one Federal agencies covering 5,639 employees. Scorable responses were received from 1,799 employees. Complete anonymity of individuals and agencies was preserved. Internal checks for accuracy and validity were built into the questionnaire. Cited above are the data on usage of drugs found in Table 1 in the paper, which are based on the "second question" technique. The author states that the respondents tend to be weighted toward the higher educational and socio-economic end of the spectrum. He feels that the sample is representative of the entire group from which it was chosen, but probably not of the general population.

Item No. 78

ta llection chnique		Percentage of Respondents																	
		Marijuana	LSD	Amphet-amines	Methamphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Meperi-dine	Hydro-morphone	Codeine	Cocaine	Morphine	Paregoric	Peyote	STP	Meth-adone	Psilo-cybin	DMT	PCP
-item	Any use	13	4	7	2	4	5	9	3	5	3	3	8	2	2	3	2	2	2
lf-admin. estionnaire	6 times or more	4	<1	4	-	2	<1	3	<1	1	<1	-	2	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1

W., "Drug/Alcohol Survey. II: Usage Among a Group of VA sychol., Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 2-5, 1972.

NOTES

In August 1971 a drug/alcohol questionnaire was given to 680 patients in a VA hospital. Scorable responses were received from 162 patients. Complete anonymity of individuals was preserved. Internal checks for accuracy and validity were built into the questionnaire. Cited above are the data on usage of drugs found in Table 1 in the paper, which are based on the "second question" technique. The author states that the mean socio-economic level of the respondents was in the lower middle class.

Item No. 79

Geog. Region	Community Size (pop)	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
South Atl.	City (133,000)	Interview	1,000

	Percentage of Respondents						
	Marijuana	LSD	Mescaline or Peyote	Amphet-amines	Barbi-turates	Heroin	Glue
Have tried it before or might try occasionally	5.2	0.6	1.1	6.3	8.5	0.2	0.8
Use when I feel like it	2.3	0.6	1.0	2.1	2.6	0.4	0.6
Use freely or have tried:							
Blacks	7.8	1.3	2.3	2.9	6.1	0.5	2.3
Whites	7.7	1.3	2.4	12.6	15.5	0.6	0.8

th Services Bureau, A Study of the Knowledge and Attitudes of erning Drug Use and Abuse. Mimeo, 46 p., Youth Services Bureau Winston-Salem, North Carolina, March 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on extent of use of drugs found in this report. The figures are based on the responses of the first 1,000 interviewees out of a total random sample of 1,035. In the report, the figures for marijuana are broken down by age groups. Data on extent of use are not a prominent part of this report, since, as the title indicates, the study was concerned primarily with knowledge and attitudes.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique
Approximately 5,300 U.S. Army personnel in 40 separate units from 12 military communities in West Germany. Fall 1970 and Fall 1971.	Questionnaire

Prevalency of Illegal Drugs Used in the U.S. Army, Percentage

Drug Use	1970
Used illegal drug one or more times in life	46
Currently uses illegal drugs more than three times per week	16
Currently uses drugs "harder" than hashish more than three times per week	4
Currently uses opiates more than three times per week	<0.5

NOTES

Cited above is the quantitative information on the extent of use of this paper. No breakdown by specific drugs is given. Nor is it stated total for the two years or an approximate number surveyed in each year. data on drug abuse requiring treatment, hospitalizations for drug abuse of available drugs and complications, education, treatment, and rehabili

REFERENCE

Tennant, Forrest S., Jr. (Maj., MC, USAR), "Drug Abuse the U.S. Army, Europe". Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 221, No. 10, pp. 1146-1149, September 4, 1972.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Enlisted men representative of the U. S. Armed Services. Sep. 70 - Sep. 71	World-wide	73-item self-admin. questionnaire	8,643 6,830 6,703 14,334 36,510

Projected DoD Perc

	Marijuana	Other Psychedelics	Stimulants
Any Use in Past Year	42.7	29.4	28.0
Army	21.8	12.1	11.9
Navy	38.0	22.9	24.1
Marine Corps	16.3	8.3	7.1
Air Force	29.9	18.8	17.9
All Services			
Any Use in Past Year by Service Location			
Army			
Continental U.S.	41.3	28.4	28.9
Europe	40.2	33.0	23.0
Vietnam	50.9	30.8	31.9
Other Southeast Asia	42.0	23.2	24.7
Total Army	42.7	29.4	28.0
Navy			
Continental U.S.	23.4	13.0	13.0
Europe	12.4	8.1	6.4
Southeast Asia	18.6	9.2	9.3
Total Navy	21.8	12.1	11.9
Marine Corps			
Continental U.S.	37.6	22.9	24.2
Okinawa	41.8	24.3	24.0
Other Southeast Asia	37.5	21.7	23.1
Total USMC	38.0	22.9	24.1
Air Force			
Continental U.S.	15.8	8.4	7.3
Europe	12.6	8.5	5.0
Turkey	13.4	9.2	7.8
Vietnam	23.6	7.9	6.9
Thailand	22.7	7.7	8.1
Taiwan	21.8	8.6	11.3
Other Southeast Asia	16.9	6.5	6.7
Total USAF	16.3	8.3	7.1

NOTES

The projected percentages in the first tabulation above (found in were extrapolated from the survey sample data and weighted according the military force as of August 31, 1971. They are not additive acro of multiple drug use. The data on users are further broken down in th frequency classes and average rates of use are given by Service and down by Service location is Table 18, p. 23, in the report. Correspo be found in Tables 19 and 20. Data are also given on use of drugs in multiple drug use, various demographic correlates of drug use, and or also contains findings on drug acquisition, availability, sources of d problems by admitted users of nontherapeutic drugs. Reasons for p by the author in a companion report (HumRRO Technical Report 7

REFERENCE

Fisher, Allan H., Jr., Preliminary Findings from the 1971 DoD Survey of Drug Use. HumRRO Technical Report 72-8, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, March 1972.

Item No. 80

	Data Collection Technique
y personnel in 40 tary communities	Questionnaire

Prevalency of Illegal Drugs Used in the U.S. Army, Europe

Drug Use	Percentage 1970	1971
Used illegal drug one or more times in life	46	46
Currently uses illegal drugs more than three times per week	16	16
Currently uses drugs "harder" than hashish more than three times per week	4	6
Currently uses opiates more than three times per week	<0.5	1.5

aj., MC, USAR), "Drug Abuse the U.S. Army, Europe". Journal of ation, Vol. 221, No. 10, pp. 1146-1149, September 4, 1972.

NOTES

Listed above is the quantitative information on the extent of use of illegal drugs found in this paper. No breakdown by specific drugs is given. Nor is it stated whether the 5,300 is a total for the two years or an approximate number surveyed in each year. The paper includes some data on drug abuse requiring treatment, hospitalizations for drug abuse by cause, and discussion of available drugs and complications, education, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Item No. 81

	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
e of	World-wide	73-item self-admin. questionnaire	8,643
			6,830
			6,703
			14,334
			36,510

Projected DoD Percentage

	Marijuana	Other Psychedelics	Stimulants	Depressants	Narcotics
Any Use in Past Year	42.7	29.4	28.0	20.4	20.1
Army	21.8	12.1	11.9	6.7	6.1
Navy	38.0	22.9	24.1	14.8	13.6
Marine Corps	16.3	8.3	7.1	4.6	4.2
Air Force	29.9	18.8	17.9	12.2	11.7
All Services					
Any Use in Past Year by Service Location					
Army	41.3	28.4	28.9	21.5	20.1
Continental U.S.	40.2	33.0	23.0	14.0	13.3
Europe	50.9	30.8	31.9	25.1	28.5
Vietnam	42.0	23.2	24.7	18.1	17.6
Other Southeast Asia	42.7	29.4	28.0	20.4	20.1
Total Army					
Navy	23.4	13.0	13.0	7.2	6.5
Continental U.S.	12.4	8.1	6.4	3.4	3.6
Europe	18.6	9.2	9.3	5.6	5.4
Southeast Asia	21.8	12.1	11.9	6.7	6.1
Total Navy					
Marine Corps	37.6	22.9	24.2	15.0	13.6
Continental U.S.	41.8	24.3	24.0	14.2	13.9
Okinawa	37.5	21.7	23.1	13.6	12.4
Other Southeast Asia	38.0	22.9	24.1	14.8	13.6
Total USMC					
Air Force	15.8	8.4	7.3	4.7	4.4
Continental U.S.	12.6	8.5	5.0	3.0	1.8
Europe	13.4	9.2	7.8	4.8	3.6
Turkey	23.6	7.9	6.9	5.0	6.0
Vietnam	22.7	7.7	8.1	4.1	3.4
Thailand	21.8	8.6	11.3	7.0	8.0
Taiwan	16.9	6.5	6.7	4.3	3.7
Other Southeast Asia	16.3	8.3	7.1	4.6	4.2
Total USAF					

eliminary Findings from the 19'1 DoD Survey of Drug Use. HumRRO man Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, 314, March 1972.

NOTES

The projected percentages in the first tabulation above (found in Table 7, p. 15 in the report), were extrapolated from the survey sample data and weighted according to the composition and size of the military force as of August 31, 1971. They are not additive across rows, due to the possibility of multiple drug use. The data on users are further broken down in the report into a number of frequency classes, and average rates of use are given by Service and frequency class. The breakdown by Service location is Table 18, p. 23, in the report. Corresponding figures on daily use may be found in Tables 19 and 20. Data are also given on use of drugs in combination with alcohol, multiple drug use, various demographic correlates of drug use, and origins of drug use. The report also contains findings on drug acquisition, availability, sources of supply, and recognition of drug problems by admitted users of nontherapeutic drugs. Reasons for drug use and other topics are probed by the author in a companion report (HumRRO Technical Report 72-9).

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Youth, ages 12 to 25 in the schools of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania 1971.	Mid-Atl.	160-item self-admin. questionnaire	5,981

		Percentage of Students Per School				
		Marijuana	LSD, etc.	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Her
Junior High Schools:	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Average	7.0	2.2	3.4	3.7	
	High	25.0	8.3	11.8	17.7	
High Schools:	Low	5.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	
	Average	21.2	5.6	5.6	4.1	
	High	43.4	13.0	13.9	10.7	
Private Schools:	Low	5.6	2.8	1.4	0.0	
	Average	26.3	5.6	5.5	3.7	
	High	46.5	25.6	18.7	7.0	
Colleges:	Low	16.9	1.4	7.1	0.0	
	Average	37.0	7.6	11.9	6.1	
	High	70.0	30.0	26.6	9.5	

REFERENCE

Pilnick, Saul and Streit, Fred, A Survey of Drug Usage and Abuse in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Prepared by Scientific Resources Inc., Human Systems Institute, 41 Skyline Drive, Morristown, New Jersey 07960 for Montgomery County Drug Commission, Norristown, Pennsylvania, August 1971 (In Drug Abuse Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, November 1971; ED-066 674)

NOTES

The principal findings on extent of drug use given in this report are summarized above. figures pertain to "heavy use" of the indicated drugs, defined by the authors as follows:

Marijuana:	five or more times,
LSD:	three or more times,
Amphetamines:	eleven or more times,
Barbiturates:	eleven or more times, and
Heroin:	three or more times.

The terms "Low" and "High" refer to the range of use found within each type of school. The includes an analysis of the use of each drug in relation to the availability of the drug, a in relation to certain social and demographic characteristics. Total incidence is given fo use of single drugs, and for use of various combinations of two or more drugs.

A stratified random sample was surveyed in each of the high schools. In the colleges, the participation was on a voluntary basis, which would invalidate some of the college data self-selection and nonrandomization. The study also included interviews with a sample of s

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Enlisted Vietnam returnees in ranks E-6 or below and age 26 or below processing for ETS separation March 1971	55-item self-admin. anonymous questionnaire	1,011

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana	Acid	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin or Morphine	Opi
Prior to Tour in Vietnam						
Experimental (1-4 times)	13.40	5.76	4.06	3.67		2
Casual (5-19)	14.90	10.39	5.85	4.67	3.08	2
Heavy (20-199)	12.01	2.29	3.67	2.76	2.48	2
Habitual (200+)	8.46	0.30	0.39	0.60	0.59	0
During Tour in Vietnam						
Experimental (1-4)	13.62	5.36	5.56	4.95	5.77	5
Casual (5-19)	11.13	8.95	6.96	5.85	4.50	7
Heavy (20-199)	16.50	0.30	3.36	2.10	9.15	5
Habitual (200+)	17.54	0.30	0.49	2.48	3.18	0
Current Use = During Last 30 Days						
Experimental (1-4)	7.73	3.26	3.47	2.77	4.27	5
Casual (5-10)	7.63	0.59	1.29	2.66	3.47	2
Heavy (11-29)	9.84	0.10	0.69	0.99	4.27	0
Habitual (30+)	11.90	0.19	0.30	0.59	4.17	0
Ever Used	63.10	16.20	20.69	18.27	23.38	20

REFERENCE

Nelson, K. Eric and Panzarella, Jacob, "Preliminary Findings--Prevalence of Drug Use, Enlisted Vietnam Returnees Processing for ETS Separation, Oakland Overseas Processing Center, March 1971." Mimeo. 8 p.

NOTES

The above data are found in the tables in this paper. "Acid" refers to "LSD, Peyote, etc." It should that the frequency categories for usage during the last 30 days differ from those for the "Prior to" and "Du classifications; they are designed to approximate "experimental" through "habitual" use for a one-month peri

Questionnaires were administered to groups varying from 15 to 100 persons as they were undergoing proce separation from the service. The medical basis of the survey and the anonymity of the respondents were empha

Item No. 82

...on Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
...ges 12 to ...e schools ...omery ...ania	Mid-Atl.	160-item self-admin. question-naire	5,981

		Percentage of Students Per School				
		Marijuana	LSD, etc.	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
Junior High Schools:	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Average	7.0	2.2	3.4	3.7	1.1
	High	25.0	8.3	11.8	17.7	11.8
High Schools:	Low	5.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
	Average	21.2	5.6	5.6	4.1	1.8
	High	43.4	13.0	13.9	10.7	5.7
Private Schools:	Low	5.6	2.8	1.4	0.0	0.0
	Average	26.3	5.6	5.5	3.7	1.5
	High	46.5	25.6	18.7	7.0	4.6
Colleges:	Low	16.9	1.4	7.1	0.0	0.0
	Average	37.0	7.6	11.9	6.1	2.1
	High	70.0	30.0	26.6	9.5	6.6

...CE

... Saul and Streit, Fred, A Survey ... Usage and Abuse in Montgomery ... Pennsylvania. Prepared by ...ific Resources Inc., Human Systems ...te, 41 Skyline Drive, Morristown, ...ey 07960 for Montgomery County ...mission, Norristown, Pennsylvania, ...1971 (In Drug Abuse Montgomery ... Pennsylvania, November 1971; ...674)

NOTES

The principal findings on extent of drug use given in this report are summarized above. The figures pertain to "heavy use" of the indicated drugs, defined by the authors as follows:

Marijuana:	five or more times,
LSD:	three or more times,
Amphetamines:	eleven or more times,
Barbiturates:	eleven or more times, and
Heroin:	three or more times.

The terms "Low" and "High" refer to the range of use found within each type of school. The report includes an analysis of the use of each drug in relation to the availability of the drug, as well as in relation to certain social and demographic characteristics. Total incidence is given for exclusive use of single drugs, and for use of various combinations of two or more drugs.

A stratified random sample was surveyed in each of the high schools. In the colleges, some of the participation was on a voluntary basis, which would invalidate some of the college data due to self-selection and nonrandomization. The study also included interviews with a sample of students.

Item No. 83

Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
55-item self-admin. anonymous questionnaire	1,011

	Percentage of Respondents					
	Marijuana	Acid	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin or Morphine	Opium
Prior to Tour in Vietnam						
Experimental (1-4 times)	13.40	5.76	4.06	3.67		2.98
Casual (5-19)	14.90	10.39	5.85	4.67	3.08	2.37
Heavy (20-199)	12.01	2.29	3.67	2.76	2.48	2.37
Habitual (200+)	8.46	0.30	0.39	0.60	0.59	0.00
During Tour in Vietnam						
Experimental (1-4)	13.62	5.36	5.56	4.95	5.77	5.86
Casual (5-19)	11.13	8.95	6.96	5.85	4.50	7.26
Heavy (20-199)	16.50	0.30	3.36	2.10	9.15	5.86
Habitual (200+)	17.54	0.30	0.49	2.48	3.18	0.49
Current Use = During Last 30 Days						
Experimental (1-4)	7.73	3.26	3.47	2.77	4.27	5.17
Casual (5-10)	7.63	0.59	1.29	2.66	3.47	2.68
Heavy (11-29)	9.84	0.10	0.69	0.99	4.27	0.89
Habitual (30+)	11.90	0.19	0.30	0.59	4.17	0.39
Ever Used	63.10	16.20	20.60	18.27	23.38	20.48

NOTES

The above data are found in the tables in this paper. "Acid" refers to "LSD, Peyote, etc." It should be noted that the frequency categories for usage during the last 30 days differ from those for the "Prior to" and "During" classifications; they are designed to approximate "experimental" through "habitual" use for a one-month period.

Questionnaires were administered to groups varying from 15 to 100 persons as they were undergoing processing for separation from the service. The medical basis of the survey and the anonymity of the respondents were emphasized.

...Panzarella, Jacob, ...--Prevalence of ...Vietnam Returnees ...eparation, Oakland ...Center, March 1971."

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Students in schools and colleges in 12 communities in Maine Fall 1970	New England	33-item self-admin. questionnaire	15,880

	Percentage of Respondents						
Number of Times Used	Marijuana	Psychedelics	Speed	Pills	Codeine	Nutmeg	Heroi
1-2	6.7	2.5	3.3	4.3	3.3	1.3	0.9
3-7	3.6	1.6	1.8	3.3	1.6	0.6	0.1
8-15	3.1	0.5	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.7	-
16 or more	7.1	0.9	0.7	1.2	1.6	1.0	0.4
Total	20.0	5.5	6.5	9.9	7.2	3.6	1.4
Presently Using	12.2	2.1	3.0	3.2	4.5	1.5	0.3

REFERENCE

New England Learning and Research, Inc., A Survey of Drug Use in a Cross-Section of Maine Communities. Prepared for the Interagency Commission on Drug Abuse by New England Learning and Research, Inc., 85 Cony Street, Augusta, Maine 04330, March 1971.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data found in this report on the use of the indicated substances "fo purposes". Pills a identified in the questionnaire as "ups and downs", psychedelics as "Mesc/L associated with cough syrup, and nutmeg means nutmeg or cinnamon.

The 12 communities were selected to be representative of the state. The survey covered the in those communities. The questionnaire, reproduced in the report, covered a wide range of social characteristics. Anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed.

Population Surveyed	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Cocaine	Barbiturates	Heroin	Multiple drugs with heroin	O
Military personnel assigned to the Army's 23rd Infantry Division, Vietnam. Fall 1970.	3,070	Usage: Prior to Army	27.9	6.6	9.2	3.3	6.6	0.2	3.2	
	3,081	While in Vietnam	33.6	4.0	10.4	5.5	10.1	0.4	6.0	
	3,055	At present	18.5	2.3	4.8	3.2	4.3	0.4	3.4	
First-term airmen at USAF, Korat, Thailand. Early 1971.	1,215	Current use	39	6	12		11	8		
American high school students (Grades 9-12) in Bangkok, Thailand. Late autumn 1970 and early 1971.	911	Frequency of use:								
		Sometimes	37							
		Daily	14							
		Once/week	24							
		Once/month or less	36							
		Ex-user	23							
Personnel leaving the Army's 2nd Infantry Division, Deros, Korea. October 1970-July 1971.	1,200+	Current use	22.9							

REFERENCE

Baker, Stewart L., Jr. (Col., MC), "Present Status of the Drug Abuse Counteroffensive in the Armed Forces". Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, Vol. 48, No. 5, pp. 719-732, June 1972.

NOTES

As in the author's June 1971 report (See Item No. 93), the sur based primarily on the anonymous questionnaire technique. In the f is information on the relationship between type of drug used and le marijuana use tends to increase with educational level, while the r for multiple drug use with heroin. In the school survey, data on t urates, heroin and LSD are cited in terms of frequency of use of ma is that about 8 percent of the 911 students admitted to the use of on the fourth survey provide the additional information that 13.4 p dangerous drugs, 6.4 percent use narcotics, and that between Octobe centage of drug users rose from 5.3 to 9.9. A considerable portion with the total panorama of drug abuse counteroffensives, particular

Item No. 84

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
New England	33-item self-admin. questionnaire	15,880

	Percentage of Respondents							
	Marijuana	Psychedelics	Speed	Pills	Codeine	Nutmeg	Heroin	Glue or Solvents
Number of Times Used								
1-2	6.2	2.5	3.3	4.3	3.3	1.3	0.9	2.6
3-7	3.6	1.6	1.8	3.3	1.6	0.6	0.1	1.6
8-15	3.1	0.5	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.7	-	0.9
16 or more	7.1	0.9	0.7	1.2	1.6	1.0	0.4	0.7
Total	20.0	5.5	6.5	9.9	7.2	3.6	1.4	5.8
Presently Using	12.2	2.1	3.0	3.2	4.5	1.5	0.3	1.3

d Research, Inc., A Survey o
tion of Maine Communities.
gency Commission on Drug Abuse
and Research, Inc., 85 Cony
04330, March 1971.

NOTES

Tabulated above are the data found in this report on the use of the indicated substances "for other than medicinal purposes". Pills are identified in the questionnaire as "ups and downs", psychedelics as "Mesc/LSD"; codeine is associated with cough syrup, and nutmeg means nutmeg or cinnamon.

The 12 communities were selected to be representative of the state. The survey covered the school-age populations in those communities. The questionnaire, reproduced in the report, covered a wide range of social and demographic characteristics. Anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed.

Item No. 85

Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents									
		Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Cocaine	Barbiturates	Heroin	Multiple drugs with heroin	Opiates	Multiple drugs without heroin	Other
	Usage:										
3,070	Prior to Army	27.9	6.6	9.2	3.3	6.6	0.2	3.2	3.3	10.7	3.3
3,081	While in Vietnam	33.6	4.0	10.4	5.5	10.1	0.4	6.0	6.4	10.3	3.9
3,055	At present	18.5	2.3	4.8	3.2	4.3	0.4	3.4	3.4	5.1	2.1
1,215	Current use	39	6	12		11	8				
911	Frequency of use:										
	Sometimes	37									
	Daily	14									
	Once/week	24									
	Once/month or less	36									
	Ex-user	23									
1,200+	Current use	22.9									

Col., MC), "Present Status of the Drug Abuse Counteroffensive in
an of the New York Academy of Medicine, Vol. 48, No. 5, pp. 719-

NOTES

As in the author's June 1971 report (See Item No. 93), the surveys reported in this paper were based primarily on the anonymous questionnaire technique. In the first survey cited above, there is information on the relationship between type of drug used and level of education, showing that marijuana use tends to increase with educational level, while the reverse appears to be the case for multiple drug use with heroin. In the school survey, data on the use of amphetamines, barbiturates, heroin and LSD are cited in terms of frequency of use of marijuana. A significant finding is that about 8 percent of the 911 students admitted to the use of heroin at some time. The data on the fourth survey provide the additional information that 13.4 percent of the respondents use dangerous drugs, 6.4 percent use narcotics, and that between October 1970 and July 1971, the percentage of drug users rose from 5.3 to 9.9. A considerable portion of this report is concerned with the total panorama of drug abuse counteroffensives, particularly within the armed services.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Other Psycho-togens	Methe-drine
All New York State household members age 14 or older, 1970 (Base population: 13,784,000)	Mid-Atl	Interview	7,378	Never Used	87.7	95.8	95.8	96.3
				Former Users	3.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
				Infrequent Users	4.0	1.1	1.0	0.6
				Regular Users	3.5	0.3	0.1	0.3
				No data	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.9
All New York City household members age 14 and older, 1970 (Base population: 6,161,000)			1,260	Never Used	85.0	94.8	94.7	95.6
				Former Users	3.5	1.1	1.4	1.1
				Infrequent Users	4.4	1.4	1.2	0.6
				Regular Users	5.2	0.5	0.2	0.3
				No data	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.3

REFERENCE

Chambers, Carl D. and Inciardi, James. A., An Assessment of Drug Use in the General Population. New York: New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971.

Percentage of Population

Heroin	Cocaine	Solvents/ Inhalants	Barbit-urates	Other Sedatives	Minor Tran-quilizers	Major Tran-quilizers	Anti-depres-sants	Pep Pills	Diet Pills
97.2	95.4	96.4	78.1	88.4	77.9	94.5	95.3	91.9	86.7
0.6	2.0	1.4	12.8	4.9	9.7	2.1	1.3	3.6	7.8
0.2	0.7	0.2	4.5	2.5	6.4	0.7	0.9	1.9	2.3
0.2	0.1	0.1	2.6	1.4	3.8	0.5	0.3	0.8	1.6
1.8	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.8	2.2	2.3	2.2	1.8	1.6
96.1	94.5	95.4	79.2	85.3	78.7	93.1	94.4	90.6	87.9
1.0	2.1	1.9	10.8	5.0	8.2	2.7	1.4	3.4	6.2
0.3	1.2	0.2	4.1	3.4	6.7	0.7	1.2	2.6	2.3
0.5	<0.1	<0.1	3.4	1.9	3.7	0.6	0.4	1.1	1.9
2.1	2.2	2.5	2.4	3.4	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.3	1.7

NOTES

The data cited above are part of the results of a major interview sur prevalence, incidence, frequency, and situational content of all types of population. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with selected persons users are defined as those who have not used the drug in the past six mon those who use the drug fewer than six times per month, while regular user use the drug at least six times per month. In addition to the categories the report are broken down by sex, employment status, age, ethnicity, soc tion, use characteristics, and concurrent regular use of other drugs. Fi those given above are cited for 16 regions in the state. The projections sent are based on relatively small sub-samples (average size: 382).

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Occupational Group		Marijuana	LSD	Methedrine	Heroin	Barbi-turates	Other Sedatives	Minor Tran-quilizers	Major Tran-quilizers	Anti-depres-sants
Labor force in New York State, 1970 (Base Population: 13,649,000)	Mid-Atl	Interview	7,378	Professionals, technical workers, managers and owners	Ever Used	10.3	1.4	1.3	0.7	23.6	11.2	23.1	4.3	2.1
					Regular Use	2.8	0.1	0.1	0.2	2.6	1.2	3.0	0.2	---
				Clerical and other white collar workers	Ever Used	12.4	2.6	2.4	0.7	20.8	8.7	23.2	4.6	2.1
					Regular Use	4.0	---	0.2	0.6	1.6	0.8	5.7	1.4	0.3
				Skilled and semi-skilled workers	Ever Used	13.4	2.8	2.1	1.4	13.5	7.6	15.5	2.6	2.3
					Regular Use	3.6	0.2	---	0.3	1.1	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.3
				Unskilled workers	Ever Used	14.7	4.3	3.0	1.8	13.4	4.8	14.1	3.7	1.5
					Regular Use	5.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.1	1.8	3.1	0.3	0.3
				Service and protective workers	Ever Used	9.8	2.8	2.0	1.5	15.2	9.3	17.5	2.2	0.7
					Regular Use	4.0	0.3	---	---	3.7	1.1	4.3	0.5	---
				Sales workers	Ever Used	13.6	4.2	2.4	2.1	32.0	6.7	25.0	2.1	1.7
					Regular Use	8.6	2.6	0.7	2.1	12.3	0.2	4.3	2.1	---
				Farmers	Ever Used	1.6	---	---	---	6.3	3.2	3.2	3.1	---
					Regular Use	---	---	---	---	---	1.6	---	---	---
				Total employed	Ever Used	12.1	2.6	2.0	1.3	18.9	8.6	19.5	3.2	2.0
					Regular Use	4.0	0.3	0.1	0.5	2.8	1.0	3.2	0.7	0.2
				Not Employed Housewives	Ever Used	2.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	25.5	8.6	26.3	3.0	3.3
					Regular Use	0.2	0.1	---	---	2.4	1.8	5.3	0.4	0.6
				Other Not Employed	Ever Used	15.1	3.9	[illegible]	1.5	17.3	8.5	14.6	3.2	2.5
					Regular Use	5.8	0.7	0.7	0.2	3.1	1.4	3.8	0.6	0.2
				Total Not Employed	Ever Used	8.7	2.2	1.6	0.9	21.1	8.5	20.4	3.1	3.1
					Regular Use	3.1	0.4	0.4	0.1	2.7	1.6	4.6	0.5	0.4
				Total	Ever Used	10.5	2.5	1.7	1.1	20.0	8.6	19.8	3.2	2.5
					Regular Use	3.6	0.4	0.2	0.3	2.8	1.3	3.8	0.6	0.3

Percentage of Employed Workers in the Listed Occupati

129

REFERENCES

[1] Chambers, Carl D., Differential Drug Use Within the New York State Labor Force. New York: New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971.

[2] Chambers, Carl D. and Heckman, Richard D., "The Extent of Drug Abuse in Business and Industry". On pp. 115-159 in Employee Drug Abuse: A Manager's Guide for Action. Boston, Massachusetts: Cahners Books, 1972.

NOTES

The data cited above were derived from a supplementary analysis of th by Item No. 86. (References [1] and [2] contain essentially the same inf "Not Employed" categories are omitted in [2].) "Ever Used" includes "For Users", and "Regular Users". Also given in [2] are figures on the percen each drug who use the drug while at work.

13

Item No. 86

Data Collection Technique	Sample Size		Marijuana/ Hashish	LSD	Other Psycho-togens	Methe-drine
Interview	7,378	Never Used	87.7	95.8	95.8	96.3
		Former Users	3.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
		Infrequent Users	4.0	1.1	1.0	0.6
		Regular Users	3.5	0.3	0.1	0.3
		No data	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.9
	1,260	Never Used	85.0	94.8	94.7	95.6
		Former Users	3.5	1.1	1.4	1.1
		Infrequent Users	4.4	1.4	1.2	0.6
		Regular Users	5.2	0.5	0.2	0.3
		No data	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.3

Percentage of Population												
Heroin	Cocaine	Solvents/ Inhalants	Barbit-urates	Other Sedatives	Minor Tran-quil-izers	Major Tran-quil-izers	Anti-depres-sants	Pep Pills	Diet Pills	Non-Controlled Narcotics	Controlled (Non-heroin)	Other Stimu-lants
97.2	95.4	96.4	78.1	88.4	77.9	94.5	95.3	91.9	86.7	63.1	90.0	82.2
0.6	2.0	1.4	12.8	4.9	9.7	2.1	1.3	3.6	7.8	24.6	6.3	12.4
0.2	0.7	0.2	4.5	2.5	6.4	0.7	0.9	1.9	2.3	8.5	1.1	3.2
0.2	0.1	0.1	2.6	1.4	3.8	0.5	0.3	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.1	0.2
1.8	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.8	2.2	2.3	2.2	1.8	1.6	2.4	2.4	2.0
96.1	94.5	95.4	79.2	86.3	78.7	93.1	94.4	90.6	87.9	68.6	91.6	86.3
1.0	2.1	1.9	10.8	5.0	8.2	2.7	1.4	3.4	6.2	20.1	4.2	8.8
0.3	1.2	0.2	4.1	3.4	6.7	0.7	1.2	2.6	2.3	7.4	1.2	2.0
0.5	<0.1	<0.1	3.4	1.9	3.7	0.6	0.4	1.1	1.9	1.3	<0.1	0.3
2.1	2.2	2.5	2.4	3.4	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.3	1.7	2.7	3.1	2.7

i, James. A., An Assessment of Drug Use in the General
ork State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971.

NOTES

The data cited above are part of the results of a major interview survey designed to assess the prevalence, incidence, frequency, and situational content of all types of drug use within the general population. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with selected persons aged 14 and above. Former users are defined as those who have not used the drug in the past six months, infrequent users are those who use the drug fewer than six times per month, while regular users are those who currently use the drug at least six times per month. In addition to the categories cited above, the data in the report are broken down by sex, employment status, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, education, use characteristics, and concurrent regular use of other drugs. Figures corresponding to those given above are cited for 16 regions in the state. The projections which the figures represent are based on relatively small sub-samples (average size: 382).

Item No. 87

Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Occupational Group		Marijuana	LSD	Methedrine	Heroin	Barbi-turates	Other Sedatives	Minor Tran-quilizers	Major Tran-quilizers	Anti-depres-sants	Pep Pills	Diet Pills	Narcotics (Nonheroin)
Interview	7,378	Professionals, technical workers, managers and owners	Ever Used	10.3	1.4	1.3	0.7	23.6	11.2	23.1	4.3	2.1	8.3	11.3	11.7
			Regular Use	2.8	0.1	0.1	0.2	2.6	1.2	3.0	0.2	---	0.8	2.0	0.2
		Clerical and other white collar workers	Ever Used	12.4	2.6	2.4	0.7	20.8	8.7	23.2	4.6	2.1	7.0	14.4	4.8
			Regular Use	4.0	---	0.2	0.6	1.6	0.8	5.7	1.4	0.3	0.8	2.5	0.1
		Skilled and semi-skilled workers	Ever Used	13.4	2.8	2.1	1.4	13.5	7.6	15.5	2.6	2.3	5.8	8.0	5.1
			Regular Use	3.6	0.2	---	0.3	1.1	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.2
		Unskilled workers	Ever Used	14.7	4.3	3.0	1.8	13.4	4.8	14.1	3.7	1.5	6.1	7.7	3.7
			Regular Use	5.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.1	1.8	3.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3
		Service and protective workers	Ever Used	9.8	2.8	2.0	1.5	15.2	9.3	17.5	2.2	0.7	9.2	7.4	6.9
			Regular Use	4.0	0.3	---	---	3.7	1.1	..3	0.5	---	0.8	0.5	0.3
		Sales workers	Ever Used	13.6	4.2	2.4	2.1	32.0	6.7	25.0	2.1	1.7	5.9	13.3	7.3
			Regular Use	8.6	2.6	0.7	2.1	12.3	0.2	4.3	2.1	---	1.4	3.6	0.9
		Farmers	Ever Used	1.6	---	---	---	6.3	.2	3.2	3.1	---	3.2	1.6	1.6
			Regular Use	---	---	---	---	---	1.6	---	---	---	---	---	---
		Total employed	Ever Used	12.1	2.6	2.0	1.3	18.9	8.6	19.5	3.2	2.0	6.9	10.2	6.9
			Regular Use	4.0	0.3	0.1	0.5	2.8	1.0	3.2	0.7	0.2	0.7	1.6	0.3
		Not Employed Housewives	Ever Used	2.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	25.5	8.6	26.3	3.0	3.8	4.3	18.9	10.3
			Regular Use	0.2	0.1	---	---	2.4	1.8	5.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	2.7	0.0
		Other Not Employed	Ever Used	15.1	3.9	2.8	1.5	17.3	8.5	14.6	3.2	2.5	6.6	8.1	5.8
			Regular Use	5.8	0.7	0.7	0.2	3.1	1.4	3.8	0.6	0.2	1.6	0.8	0.0
		Total Not Employed	Ever Used	8.7	2.2	1.6	0.9	21.1	8.5	20.4	3.1	3.1	5.4	13.3	8.0
			Regular Use	3.1	0.4	0.4	0.1	2.7	1.6	4.6	0.5	0.4	0.9	1.7	0.0
		Total	Ever Used	10.5	2.5	1.7	1.1	20.0	8.6	19.8	3.2	2.5	6.3	11.5	7.4
			Regular Use	3.6	0.4	0.2	0.3	2.8	1.3	3.8	0.6	0.3	0.8	1.6	0.2

12.9

rential Drug Use Within the New York State Labor Force. New
rcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971.

ckman, Richard D., "The Extent of Drug Abuse in Business and
59 in Employee Drug Abuse: A Manager's Guide for Action.
Cahners Books, 1972.

NOTES

The data cited above were derived from a supplementary analysis of the data in the report covered by Item No. 86. (References [1] and [2] contain essentially the same information, except that the "Not Employed" categories are omitted in [2].) "Ever Used" includes "Former Users", "Infrequent Users", and "Regular Users". Also given in [2] are figures on the percentage of regular users of each drug who use the drug while at work.

130

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique
747 enlisted men on active duty assigned at Fort Lee, Virginia. August 15-September 15, 1970.	65-item Group-admin. questionnaire

REFERENCE

Greden, John F. and Morgan, Donald W., "Patterns of Drug Use and Attitudes Toward Treatment in a Military Population". Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 113-117, February 1972.

	Percentage of Respon		
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Stimulants
Users of single drug type			
1-2 times	9.8	0.5	1.5
3-10 times	4.7	0.1	0.5
>10 times	4.2	0.1	0.1
Multiple drug-users			
1-2 times	3.5	4.3	5.5
3-10 times	3.9	2.0	3.0
>10 times	9.4	1.6	4.6
Heroin users			
1-2 times	0.7	1.6	0.5
3-10 times	0.4	1.2	0.5
>10 times	4.8	2.1	3.5

NOTES

The data cited above on the reported number of times drugs were us percentages of the total number of respondents (747), from data given Table 1, each percentage is related to the corresponding subgroup tota author has indicated in a private communication, tends to emphasize pr The above tabulation is a presentation of the same data in a form whic between the studies cited in this compendium. The categories "users o "multiple drug-users" do not include users of heroin, which accounts f column opposite these categories. Anonymity of respondents was preser the questionnaire. The paper also contains data on drug use in relati istics (age, race, marital status, education, rank, population of prim legal convictions).

-76-

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Persons attending conventions of the National Student Nurses' Association (NSNA) and the American Nurses' Association (ANA) in Miami, Florida. Spring 1970.	Various	19-item self-admin. questionnaire	NSNA: 1171 ANA: 962 NSNA(NY): 158 ANA(NY): 49

	Percentage of Respondents			
	Marijuana			
	NSNA	ANA	NSNA(NY)	ANA(NY)
Past use	13	3	31	2
Past exposure	45	15	67	18
Current use	4	1	13	0

REFERENCE

Lipp, Martin R.; Benson, Samuel G.; and Allen, Patricia S., "Marijuana Use by Nurses and Nursing Students". American Journal of Nursing, Vol. 71, No. 12, pp. 2339-2341, December 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in this pa used to denote respondents from New York State only. The paper also alcohol and cigarettes. As the authors point out, the sample in thi representative of nurses in general.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Sixty-four percent of inmates in the Dade County jail, Dade County, Florida, April and May 1970.	South Atl.	Interview and Physical Examination	171 258

	Percentage of Respondents	
	Marijuana	Amphetamine -Barbiturate
White Male	8.2	11.7
Negro Male	10.0	8.9

REFERENCE

Edmundson, Walter F.; Davies, John E.; Acker, James D.; and Myer, Bernard, "Patterns of Drug Abuse Epidemiology in Prisoners". Industrial Medicine, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 15-19, January 1972.

NOTES

The population surveyed consisted of all the prisoners in Dad May 1970 who would consent to questioning regarding their personal the data on extent of admitted drug use given in the paper. Other the paper includes a breakdown of the above data by age groups, da tion patterns of regular drug use, sequential use of illicit drugs, matters, and socio-economic patterns.

	Data Collection Technique
e duty assigned	65-item
970.	Group-admin. questionnaire

n, Donald W., "Patterns of Drug Use and Attitudes Toward
opulation". Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 113-117,

Item No. 88

	Percentage of Respondents				
	Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Stimulants	Depressants	Heroin
Users of single drug type					
1-2 times	9.8	0.5	1.5	2.4	
3-10 times	4.7	0.1	0.5	0.9	
>10 times	4.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	
Multiple drug-users					
1-2 times	3.5	4.3	5.5	5.9	
3-10 times	3.9	2.0	3.0	2.7	
>10 times	9.4	1.6	4.6	3.9	
Heroin users					
1-2 times	0.7	1.6	0.5	0.5	3.8
3-10 times	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.2
>10 times	4.8	2.1	3.5	3.2	1.6

NOTES

The data cited above on the reported number of times drugs were used have been inferred, as percentages of the total number of respondents (747), from data given in Table 1 in the paper. In Table 1, each percentage is related to the corresponding subgroup total as a base, which, as the author has indicated in a private communication, tends to emphasize prominent subgroup differences. The above tabulation is a presentation of the same data in a form which facilitates comparisons between the studies cited in this compendium. The categories "users of single drug type" and "multiple drug-users" do not include users of heroin, which accounts for the blanks in the "heroin" column opposite these categories. Anonymity of respondents was preserved in the administration of the questionnaire. The paper also contains data on drug use in relation to demographic characteristics (age, race, marital status, education, rank, population of primary residence, and reported legal convictions).

Item No. 89

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Various	19-item self-admin. questionnaire	NSNA: 1171 ANA: 962 NSNA(NY): 158 ANA(NY): 49

	Percentage of Respondents Marijuana			
	NSNA	ANA	NSNA(NY)	ANA(NY)
Past use	13	3	31	2
Past exposure	45	15	67	18
Current use	4	1	13	0

Samuel G., and Allen, Patricia S., "Marijuana Use by Nurses and
ican Journal of Nursing, Vol. 71, No. 12, pp. 2339-2341, December

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on marijuana use found in this paper. The notation (NY) is used to denote respondents from New York State only. The paper also has data on current use of alcohol and cigarettes. As the authors point out, the sample in this study is not necessarily representative of nurses in general.

Item No. 90

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
ates	South	Interview and	171
Dade	Atl.	Physical	258
d		Examination	

	Percentage of Respondents		
	Marijuana	Amphetamine -Barbiturate	Heroin
White Male	8.2	11.7	34.5
Negro Male	10.0	8.9	17.8

ries, John E.; Acker, James D.; and Myer, Bernard, "Patterns of
n Prisoners". Industrial Medicine, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 15-19,

NOTES

The population surveyed consisted of all the prisoners in Dade County jail in April and May 1970 who would consent to questioning regarding their personal data. Summarized above are the data on extent of admitted drug use given in the paper. Other information available in the paper includes a breakdown of the above data by age groups, data on alcohol use, combination patterns of regular drug use, sequential use of illicit drugs, other health-related matters, and socio-economic patterns.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Army personnel in the ranks of E-1 through LTC being processed into (incoming) and out of (outgoing) the Republic of Vietnam. November 1969.	46-item self-admin. questionnaire	2,547

* Before going to Vietnam
** In Vietnam
*** Casual use: 1-20 times in previous year
Heavy use: 21-199 times in previous year
Habitual use: 200 or more times in previous year

Percentage of Respondents

	Marijuana			Hallucinogens			Amphetamines			Barbiturates			Heroin/M
	Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming
Enlisted men		B.V.*	I.V.**		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.	
Nonusers	65.2	68.6	49.9	88.4	91.3	94.7	87.6	87.6	83.8	90.0	88.6	88.4	95.7
Users: Casual***	17.9	15.9	20.5	8.1	6.8	3.2	9.2	8.3	11.0	6.5	7.3	7.8	3.0
Heavy	9.6	8.0	11.9	3.2	1.5	1.6	2.8	2.9	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.7	1.0
Habitual	7.3	7.5	17.7	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.6	1.1	0.3
Total users	34.8	31.4	50.1	11.6	8.7	5.3	12.4	12.4	16.2	10.0	11.4	11.6	4.3
Noncommissioned Officers													
Nonusers	95.8	97.0	95.0	100	99.0	99.0	100	100	98.0	100	100	100	
Users: Casual	3.4	2.0	3.0		1.0	1.0			1.0				
Heavy	0.8	0.0	1.0		0.0	0.0			1.0				
Habitual	0.0	1.0	2.0		0.0	0.0			0.0				
Total users	4.2	3.0	6.0		1.0	1.0			2.0				
Company Grade & Warrant Officers													
Nonusers	89.7	92.0	98.4	98.4	100	100	97.0	96.8	98.4	100	98.4	98.4	100
Users: Casual	10.3	8.0	1.6	0.0			3.0	3.2	1.6		1.6	0.0	
Heavy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	1.6	
Habitual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total users	10.3	8.0	1.6	1.6			3.0	3.2	1.6		1.6	1.6	

REFERENCE

Stanton, Morris Duncan, "Drug Use in Vietnam: A Survey Among Army Personnel in the two Northern Corps". Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 279-286, March 1972.

NOTES

The questionnaire was anonymously presented to more than 80% of th ranks of E-1 and Lieutenant Colonel being processed into and out of Vie Battalion in Cam Ranh Bay during one week. Of the sample of 2,547 ques for technical reasons and 114 were rejected becau e of an age-rank sele tion rate of 6.9%. Field Grade Officers (Majors and Lieutenant Colonel lation since they reported no drug use other than barbiturates.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents
Enlisted men (E-6 and below) at Long Binh, Vietnam. August 1967.	Anonymous questionnaire	584
Psychiatric patients in the 4th Infantry Division, Pleiku, Vietnam. October 1968.	Interview	50
Surgical patients in the 4th Infantry Division, Pleiku, Vietnam. October 1968.	Anonymous questionnaire	100
Americal Division, Chu Lai, Vietnam	Anonymous	
Psychiatric patients	questionnaire	46
General medical patients		46
General medical patients		268
Soldiers leaving Vietnam (date not given)		234
Enlisted men leaving Vietnam at Cam Ranh Bay. Fall 1969.	Anonymous questionnaire	500
Airborne soldiers in II Corps, Vietnam. Early 1970.	Anonymous questionnaire	1,076

	Percentage of Respondents Marijuana
Any use while in Vietnam	30
Used 20 times or more	7.5
Any use while in Vietnam	56
Used more than 5 times	30
Any use	35
Used more than 5 times	17
Any use while in Vietnam	
	52
	33
	36
	28
Any use while in Vietnam	50
Used 20 times or more	25
Any use while in Vietnam	68
Used more than once or twice	31

REFERENCE

Colbach, Edward, "Marijuana Use by GIs in Viet Nam". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 128, No. 2, pp. 204-207, August 1971.

NOTES

The data summarized above are based on a review of the profess medical personnel. They pertain to attempts made by professionals the extent of marijuana use in Vietnam. The author emphasizes the are lower than those often put forward by the mass media. He also relationship between rank and marijuana use, i.e., marijuana use is and senior noncommissioned officers.

Item No. 91

lection / hnique	Sample Size		Percentage of Respondents																	
			Marijuana			Hallucinogens			Amphetamines			Barbiturates			Heroin/Morphine			Opium		
			Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing		Incoming	Outgoing	
				B.V.*	I.V.**		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.		B.V.	I.V.
item	2,547	Enlisted men																		
f-admin.		Nonusers	65.2	68.6	49.9	88.4	91.3	94.7	87.6	87.6	83.8	90.0	88.6	88.4	95.7	97.5	97.8	94.5	93.7	82.6
stionnaire		Users: Casual***	17.9	15.9	20.5	8.1	6.8	3.2	9.2	8.3	11.0	6.5	7.3	7.8	3.0	1.1	1.4	4.6	4.4	9.8
		Heavy	9.6	8.0	11.9	3.2	1.5	1.6	2.8	2.9	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.7	1.0	1.1	0.6	0.9	1.0	5.8
		Habitual	7.3	7.5	17.7	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.6	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.9	1.8
		Total users	34.8	31.4	50.1	11.6	8.7	5.3	12.4	12.4	16.2	10.0	11.4	11.6	4.3	2.5	2.2	5.5	6.3	17.4
		Noncommissioned Officers																		
		Nonusers	95.8	97.0	95.0	100	99.0	99.0	100	100	98.0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.0
		Users: Casual	3.4	2.0	3.0		1.0	1.0			1.0									1.0
		Heavy	0.8	0.0	1.0		0.0	0.0			1.0									0.0
		Habitual	0.0	1.0	2.0		0.0	0.0			0.0									0.0
		Total users	4.2	3.0	6.0		1.0	1.0			2.0									1.0
in previous year		Company Grade & Warrant Officers																		
s in previous year		Nonusers	89.7	92.0	98.4	98.4	100	100	97.0	96.8	98.4	100	98.4	98.4	100	100	100	100	100	100
ore times in previous		Users: Casual	10.3	8.0	1.6	0.0			3.0	3.2	1.6		1.6	0.0						
		Heavy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	1.6						
		Habitual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0						
		Total users	10.3	8.0	1.6	1.6			3.0	3.2	1.6		1.6	1.6						

NOTES

The questionnaire was anonymously presented to more than 80% of the Army personnel between the ranks of E-1 and Lieutenant Colonel being processed into and out of Vietnam at the 22nd Replacement Battalion in Cam Ranh Bay during one week. Of the sample of 2,547 questionnaires, 61 were rejected for technical reasons and 114 were rejected because of an age-rank selection criterion, for a rejection rate of 6.9%. Field Grade Officers (Majors and Lieutenant Colonels) were omitted from the tabulation since they reported no drug use other than barbiturates.

ug Use in Vietnam: A Survey Among Army Personnel in the two
of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 279-286, March 1972.

Item No. 92

	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents Marijuana
)	Anonymous questionnaire	384	Any use while in Vietnam	30
			Used 20 times or more	7.5
4th Vietnam.	Interview	50	Any use while in Vietnam	56
			Used more than 5 times	30
h Vietnam.	Anonymous questionnaire	100	Any use	35
			Used more than 5 times	17
Vietnam	Anonymous questionnaire		Any use while in Vietnam	
		46		52
		46		33
		268		36
		234		28
	Anonymous questionnaire	500	Any use while in Vietnam	50
			Used 20 times or more	25
ps,	Anonymous questionnaire	1,076	Any use while in Vietnam	68
			Used more than once or twice	31

NOTES

The data summarized above are based on a review of the professional writings of Army medical personnel. They pertain to attempts made by professionals to formally determine the extent of marijuana use in Vietnam. The author emphasizes the fact that the figures are lower than those often put forward by the mass media. He also notes a marked inverse relationship between rank and marijuana use, i.e., marijuana use is not common among officers and senior noncommissioned officers.

Use by GIs in Viet Nam". American Journal of Psychiatry,
7, August 1971.

Population Surveyed	Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Heroin	Opium
Military prisoners (not representative of any military unit) at Long Binh Stockade, Vietnam. June 1967.	Not given	Convicted for other than drug offenses: Ever Used	63		
		Marijuana offenders: First used in civilian life	80		
Men leaving the two southern corps areas in Vietnam. Fall 1967.	Approximately 4 percent of indicated population	Ever Used	31.7		
		Used while in Vietnam	28.9		
Enlisted men at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. January-April 1969.	5,000+	Ever Used	24	1.5	
Soldiers entering and departing Vietnam. Autumn 1969.	1,000 entering and 1,000 departing Vietnam	Ever Used: Entering Vietnam	31		
		Departing Vietnam	46		
		Used more than 20 times	13		
Soldiers at Fort Carson, Colorado. Spring 1970.	684	Frequency of use: More than once/week			
		More than once/week but less than once/month			
Soldiers in 173rd Airborne Brigade, Vietnam. March 1970.	1,064	Ever Used	68		
		Used at least once/week	31		
		First tried in Vietnam	22		6

REFERENCE

Baker, Stewart L., Jr. (Col., MC), "Drug Abuse in the United States Army". Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 541-549, June 1971.

NOTES

The data compiled above were obtained through several an
the results of which are summarized in this paper. As the co
on the use of marijuana. The paper is concerned mainly with
U.S. Army to control drug abuse.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Percentage M
Adults in San Francisco, California. Late 1967, early 1968.	Pacific	Urban	Interview	346	
					Married with Children:
					Protestant or Catholic
					Other or No Religious Affiliation
					Unmarried or Childless Married:
					Protestant or Catholic
					Other or No Religious Affiliation
					Total
Adults in Contra Costa County, California. 1969.	Pacific	Suburban	Interview	424	
					Married with Children:
					Protestant or Catholic
					Other or No Religious Affiliation
					Unmarried or Childless Married:
					Protestant or Catholic
					Other or No Religious Affiliation
					Total

REFERENCE

Cisin, Ira H. and Manheimer, Dean I., "Marijuana Use Among Adults in a Large City and Suburb". Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 191, pp. 222-234, December 31, 1971.

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to the percentages of re
groups who had used marijuana. The samples cited are for the
since the great majority of people who had used marijuana wer
total sample employed in the survey included men and women be
(1,028 in San Francisco and 1,164 in Contra Costa). Stratifi
used and the completion rate was 85% in each case. The two s
21 months apart, and the authors discuss the possibility that
results could be due in part to a time-related effect. They
combinations of characteristics were associated with use in t
While the major zero-order correlates of use were similar, th
terms of these correlates was quite different in the two loca
all use rates was a result of the interactions among the corr
lying dissimilarities.

Item No. 93

Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	Heroin	Opium	Not Specified
Not given	Convicted for other than drug offenses: Ever Used	63			
	Marijuana offenders: First used in civilian life	80			
Approximately 4 percent of indicated population	Ever Used	31.7			
	Used while in Vietnam	28.9			
5,000+	Ever Used	24	1.5		
1,000 entering and 1,000 departing Vietnam	Ever Used:				
	Entering Vietnam	31			
	Departing Vietnam	46			
	Used more than 20 times	13			
684	Frequency of use:				20
	More than once/week				5.6
	More than once/week but less than once/month				
1,064	Ever Used	68			
	Used at least once/week	31		6	
	First tried in Vietnam	22			

NOTES

The data compiled above were obtained through several anonymous questionnaire surveys, the results of which are summarized in this paper. As the compilation shows, emphasis was on the use of marijuana. The paper is concerned mainly with the steps being taken by the U.S. Army to control drug abuse.

ol., MC), "Drug Abuse in the United States Army". Bulletin of edicine, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 541-549, June 1971.

Item No. 94

Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana
Pacific	Urban	Interview	346	
				Married with Children:
				Protestant or Catholic 12
				Other or No Religious Affiliation 16
				Unmarried or Childless Married:
				Protestant or Catholic 22
				Other or No Religious Affiliation 60
				Total 29
Pacific	Suburban	Interview	424	
				Married with Children:
				Protestant or Catholic 11
				Other or No Religious Affiliation 26
				Unmarried or Childless Married:
				Protestant or Catholic 39
				Other or No Religious Affiliation 50
				Total 29

NOTES

The figures cited above pertain to the percentages of respondents in the indicated groups who had used marijuana. The samples cited are for the age group 18-34 years, since the great majority of people who had used marijuana were in that age range. The total sample employed in the survey included men and women between the ages of 18 and 74 (1,028 in San Francisco and 1,164 in Contra Costa). Stratified probability sampling was used and the completion rate was 85% in each case. The surveys were conducted about 21 months apart, and the authors discuss the possibility that the differences in the results could be due in part to a time-related effect. They conclude that different combinations of characteristics were associated with use in the city and its suburbs. While the major zero-order correlates of use were similar, the population distribution in terms of these correlates was quite different in the two locales. The similarity in overall use rates was a result of the interactions among the correlates and masked the underlying dissimilarities.

er, Dean I., "Marijuana Use Among Adults in a Large City and ew York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 191, pp. 222-234, December

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Ghetto youths in a work training program in northern California. 1967.	Pacific	Interview Follow-up interview	74 86

		Percentage of Respondents		
		Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines
Ever used		54	5	2
Dropouts:	Used before program	37		
	Used after program	33		
Failed test:	Used before program	40		
	Used after program	45		
Passed test:	Used before program	31		
	Used after program	44		

REFERENCE

Lipscomb, Wendell R., "Drug Use in a Black Ghetto". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 127, No. 9, pp. 1166-1169, March 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug abuse found in this paper. about 76 percent of the population studied. The author feels that the because of the circumstances of their collection. He also indicates th to those found in several other studies which he cites. In the follow- were questioned about marijuana only. The categories "failed test" and apprenticeship test given upon completion of the training. A conclusio little effect on success or failure in the work training program.

Population Surveyed	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Frequency of Use
1301 Navy enlisted men stationed at one of five bases in the Pensacola, Florida area. (Date not given)	42-item multiple choice questionnaire	1301	1-5 times 6-10 times 11-15 times 16-20 times >21 times

Percentage of Respondents				
Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
10	4	6	3	2
2	1	1	1	<1
1	<1	2	<1	<1
1	<1	1	2	<1
8	2	4	<1	<1

REFERENCE

Bucky, Steven F., The Relationship Between Past Background and Drug Use. NAMRL-1135, Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute, Naval Aerospace Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida 32512, June 28, 1971 (AD-735 102).

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the to dents, from data given in the report for four mutually exclusive drug respondents had taken the questionnaire voluntarily and anonymously; given as to how the respondents were selected. Out of an original gr asked to take the questionnaire, 207 refused, leaving the net number The questionnaire was a modification of a standardized psychiatric in

---

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique
Patients at the West Hollywood Youth Clinic, Los Angeles County, California. (Date not given)	Pacific	Urban	300 questionnaires 100 interviews

	Percentage of Respondents			
Frequency of Use	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Amphetamines
Never	8.9	22.7	31.1	34.9
Tried it*	7.2	10.7	15.1	18.7
Once a month or less	7.7	17.4	13.3	12.1
2 to 4 times a month	10.1	13.0	7.4	3.4
Every weekend or more	19.7	11.0	2.5	4.9
Every day	30.3	11.0	0.0	4.4
No longer use it	10.3	11.5	24.2	18.3

* not more than three separate contacts with the drug

REFERENCE

Minkowski, William L.; Weiss, Robert C.; and Heidbreder, G. A., "A View of the Drug Problem -- A Rational Approach to Youthful Drug Use and Abuse". Clinical Pediatrics, Vol. 11, No. 7, pp. 376-381, July 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug use found in this paper. adolescents and young adults from all socio-cultural levels and ethni with lower-middle and middle class roots. The 300 patients were sele questioning, and the 100 interviewees were part of the 300. Anonymity guaranteed. The paper includes a discussion of the distinction betwe

Item No. 95

Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Sample Size
Pacific	Interview	74
	Follow-up interview	86

		Percentage of Respondents				
		Marijuana	Hallucinogens	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
Ever used		54	5	20	4	3
Dropouts:	Used before program	37				
	Used after program	33				
Failed test:	Used before program	40				
	Used after program	45				
Passed test:	Used before program	31				
	Used after program	44				

g Use in a Black Ghetto". American Journal of Psychiatry, 1169, March 1971.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug abuse found in this paper. The sample of 74 constituted about 76 percent of the population studied. The author feels that the data are unusually reliable because of the circumstances of their collection. He also indicates that the figures are comparable to those found in several other studies which he cites. In the follow-up interviews, the trainees were questioned about marijuana only. The categories "failed test" and "passed test" refer to an apprenticeship test given upon completion of the training. A conclusion is that drug use had very little effect on success or failure in the work training program.

Item No. 96

Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Frequency of Use	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
42-item multiple choice questionnaire	1301	1-5 times	10	4	6	3	2
		6-10 times	2	1	1	1	<1
		11-15 times	1	<1	2	<1	<1
		16-20 times	3	<1	1	2	<1
		>21 times	8	2	4	<1	<1

tionship Between Past Background and Drug Use. NAMRL-1135, Naval Laboratory, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute, Naval Aerospace Florida 32512, June 28, 1971 (AD-735 102).

NOTES

The data cited above have been inferred, as percentages of the total number of respondents, from data given in the report for four mutually exclusive drug user groups. The respondents had taken the questionnaire voluntarily and anonymously; no information is given as to how the respondents were selected. Out of an original group of 1508 who were asked to take the questionnaire, 207 refused, leaving the net number of respondents of 1301. The questionnaire was a modification of a standardized psychiatric interview questionnaire.

Item No. 97

Geog. Region	Community Type	Data Collection Technique
Pacific	Urban	300 questionnaires 100 interviews

	Percentage of Respondents					
Frequency of Use	Marijuana	Hashish	LSD	Amphetamines	Barbiturates	Heroin
Never *	8.9	22.7	31.1	34.9	40.8	9.4
Tried it *	7.2	10.7	15.1	18.7	18.8	12.0
Once a month or less	7.7	17.4	13.3	12.1	5.3	2.3
2 to 4 times a month	10.1	13.0	7.4	3.4	5.9	1.1
Every weekend or more	19.7	11.0	2.5	4.9	7.6	1.2
Every day	30.3	11.0	0.0	4.4	3.6	1.7
No longer use it	10.3	11.5	24.2	18.3	17.7	

* not more than three separate contacts with the drug

ss, Robert C.; and Heidbreder, G. A., "A View of the Drug roach to Youthful Drug Use and Abuse". Clinical Pediatrics, 1, July 1972.

NOTES

Summarized above are the data on drug use found in this paper. The population consisted of adolescents and young adults from all socio-cultural levels and ethnic origins, but mostly white with lower-middle and middle class roots. The 300 patients were selected at random for written questioning, and the 100 interviewees were part of the 300. Anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed. The paper includes a discussion of the distinction between drug use and drug abuse.

Population Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Age	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana 1-6x	Marijuana >6x	LSD 1-6x	LSD >6x	Other Hallucinogens 1-6x	Other Hallucinogens >6x	Methedrine 1-6x	Methedrine >6x
Adolescents in Ohio (Date not given)	East North Central	Questionnaire	132	12	3	1	0.6	0.0	3.2	0.0	1.4	0.0
			275	13	2	2	0.7	1.2	2.5	1.0	1.4	0.7
			645	14	3	3	1.5	0.8	2.0	2.9	1.3	1.7
			953	15	4	8	2.0	2.4	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
			982	16	5	10	3.3	2.7	4.9	4.1	3.4	4.1
			1063	17	6	9	3.0	1.6	4.5	3.1	2.9	2.8
			563	18	11	8	2.6	2.8	5.9	2.6	3.0	4.2
			189	19	9	14	2.0	1.7	2.7	2.0	3.6	2.1
			149	20	10	12	2.7	0.0	4.7	1.3	2.5	2.7
			130	21	17	12	3.0	0.6	5.4	1.6	3.7	3.1
			92	22	18	13	1.1	4.5	3.5	3.0	1.0	3.3
			67	23	17	12	3.0	0.0	7.5	2.8	0.0	2.8
			23	24	14	12	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
				Sex								
			2660	Male		9.67		2.29		3.76		3.45
			2595	Female		5.28		1.50		1.97		2.08
				Color								
			4106	White		6.62		1.77		2.31		2.38
			997	Black		10.84		2.51		5.12		3.92
				Residence								
			1674	Urban		8.37		2.15		4.36		3.53
			2071	Suburban		10.90		2.17		3.19		3.62
			1461	Rural		1.58		0.62		0.62		0.62
				Religion								
			1494	Catholic		2.54		0.80		1.07		1.20
			2140	Protestan'		6.07		1.59		2.80		2.38
			440	Jewish		11.82		0.68		1.36		0.45
			1121	None		13.20		3.		5.17		5.33

REFERENCE

Coddington, R. Dean and Jacobsen, Robert, "Drug Use by Ohio Adolescents--An Epidemiologic Study." The Ohio State Medical Journal, pp. 481-484, May 1972.

NOTES

The figures on drug use by age were read, as closely as possible, from 6 in this paper. The notation 1-6x means use from one to six times; >6x de six times. The data on drug use more than six times by sex, color, residen found in Table 1 in the paper. Residence refers to the type of community i spent most of the last ten years. Under religion, "none" includes responses where no indication was given.

The authors state that questionnaires were distributed throughout seve order to obtain a representative sample of the youthful population. The qu presented to junior high and high school students and collected anonymously graduate college students, some medical students, and some adolescents in t Center (Columbus, Ohio) were included. Of 5,318 completed forms, 5,299 were the analysis of data. No further details on the survey or the questionnair paper.

Item No. 98

lation Surveyed	Geog. Region	Data Collection Technique	Number of Respondents	Age	Percentage of Respondents: Marijuana 1-6x	Marijuana >6x	LSD 1-6x	LSD >6x	Other Hallucinogens 1-6x	Other Hallucinogens >6x	Methedrine 1-6x	Methedrine >6x	Heroin 1-6x	Heroin >6x
escents in Ohio e not given)	East North Central	Question-naire	132	12	3	1	0.6	0.0	3.2	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.7
			275	13	2	2	0.7	1.2	2.5	1.0	1.4	0.7	1.4	0.6
			645	14	3	3	1.5	0.8	2.0	2.9	1.3	1.7	0.6	0.8
			953	15	4	8	2.0	2.4	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.6	1.4
			982	16	5	10	3.3	2.7	4.9	4.1	3.4	4.1	2.8	2.7
			1063	17	6	9	3.0	1.6	4.5	3.1	2.9	2.8	1.4	1.7
			563	18	11	8	2.6	2.8	5.9	2.6	3.0	4.2	0.7	1.4
			189	19	9	14	2.0	1.7	2.7	2.0	3.6	2.1	0.9	1.7
			149	20	10	12	2.7	0.0	4.7	1.3	2.5	2.7	0.0	0.0
			130	21	17	12	3.0	0.6	5.4	1.6	3.7	3.1	0.6	0.8
			92	22	18	13	1.1	4.5	3.5	3.0	1.0	3.3	0.8	0.0
			67	23	17	12	3.0	0.0	7.5	2.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0
			23	24	14	12	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
				Sex										
			2660	Male		9.67		2.29		3.76		3.45		2.29
			2595	Female		5.28		1.50		1.97		2.08		1.00
				Color										
			4106	White		6.62		1.77		2.31		2.38		0.88
			997	Black		10.84		2.51		5.12		3.92		3.92
				Residence										
			1674	Urban		8.37		2.15		4.36		3.53		2.09
			2071	Suburban		10.90		2.17		3.19		3.62		1.30
			1461	Rural		1.58		0.62		0.62		0.62		0.82
				Religion										
			1494	Catholic		2.54		0.80		1.07		1.20		0.53
			2140	Protestan'		6.07		1.59		2.80		2.38		1.45
			440	Jewish		11.82		0.68		1.36		0.45		0.68
			1121	None		13.20		3.48		5.17		5.33		2.77

RENCE

dington, R. Dean and Jacobsen, Robert, "Drug by Ohio Adolescents--An Epidemiologic Study." Ohio State Medical Journal, pp. 481-484, May 2.

NOTES

The figures on drug use by age were read, as closely as possible, from Figures 2 through 6 in this paper. The notation 1-6x means use from one to six times; >6x denotes use more than six times. The data on drug use more than six times by sex, color, residence, and religion are found in Table 1 in the paper. Residence refers to the type of community in which the respondent spent most of the last ten years. Under religion, "none" includes responses of "none" plus those where no indication was given.

The authors state th questionnaires were distributed throughout several areas in Ohio in order to obtain a representative sample of the youthful population. The questionnaires were presented to junior high and high school students and collected anonymously. A sample of undergraduate college students, some medical students, and some adolescents in the Juvenile Diagnostic Center (Columbus, Ohio) were included. Of 5,318 completed forms, 5,299 were complete enough for the analysis of data. No further details on the survey or the questionnaire are given in the paper.

APPENDIX E

MASTER LIST

Item No.	Reference
1	Response Analysis Corporation, "Drug Experience, Attitudes and Related Behavior Among Adolescents and Adults: Detailed Tabulations, Part 2C. Experience Data." A Nationwide Study for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1973.
2	Response Analysis Corporation, "Drug Experience, Attitudes and Related Behavior Among Adolescents and Adults: Detailed Tabulations, Part 2C. Experience Data." A Nationwide Study for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1973.
3	Abelson, Herbert; Cohen, Reuben; and Schrayer, Diane, "Public Attitudes Toward Marihuana, Part 1: Main Report". A Nationwide Study of Beliefs, Information and Experience prepared for the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse by Response Analysis Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, January 1972. In Marihuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding, March 1972, Volume II, pp. 856-968, GPO Stock Number 5266-0002, $10.75 per two-volume set.
4	Playboy, "Student Survey: 1971". Playboy, Vol. 18, No. 9, pp. 118, 208, 210, 212, 214, 216, September 1971.
5	Josephson, Eric; Haberman, Paul; Zanes, Anne; and Elinson, Jack, "Adolescent Marijuana Use: Report on a National Survey". Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 1-8, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.
6	Rossi, Peter H.; Groves, W. Eugene; and Grafstein, David, Life Styles and Campus Communities: A Report of a Survey of American Colleges and Universities (1969-70; 1970-71). Final report on research conducted under Grant MH16536 from the National Institute of Mental Health by Department of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins University, November 1972.
7	Gergen, Mary K.; Gergen, Kenneth J.; and Morse, Stanley J., "Correlates of Marijuana Use Among College Students." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1-16, 1972.
8	Johnston, Lloyd, Drugs and American Youth, A report from the Youth in Transition Project, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.
9	San Mateo County, California, Surveillance of Student Drug Use. Preliminary Summary-1973, The Research and Statistics Section, Department of Public Health and Welfare, 225 37th Avenue, San Mateo, California 94403, June 22, 1973.

Item No.	Reference
10	Maida, Peter, R., Parent-Peer Group Relationships and Teenage Drug Use. Final Progress Report on Public Health Service Small Research Grant No. RO3-DA-00148, Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, no date.
11	Utah State Board of Education, "Utah 1972 Statewide Drug Assessment." Mimeo, 16 p., Utah State Board of Education, Division of General Education, 1400 University Club Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.
12	McLeod, Jonnie H. and Grizzle, Gloria A., Alcohol and Other Drug Usage Among Junior and Senior High School Students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Prepared for Community Drug Action Committee, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, by the Institute of Government, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Charlotte Drug Education Center, Charlotte, North Carolina, June 19, 1972.
13	Elseroad, Homer O. and Goodman, Samuel M., Teenagers' Attitudes Toward the Use of Drugs, Alcohol, and Cigarettes. Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland, August 31, 1972.
14	Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida, Drug and Alcohol Opinionnaire and Usage Survey, Grades, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, Spring 1971; Spring 1972. Prepared by Research and Program Evaluation Section, Curriculum Division, Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida, May 1972.
15	Mobley, Jack and Harrison, James A., Drug and Alcohol Abuse in Rural Mid-Michigan. Commission on Alcohol and Drug Education (C.A.D.E.) of Shiawassee County, Michigan, Shiawassee County Intermediate School District, Corunna, Michigan 48817, March 17, 1972.
16	New Hampshire, State of, "Governor's Committee on Drug Abuse Data Collection." Mimeo, 14 p., State of New Hampshire Department of Health and Welfare, September 14, 1972.
17	Survey Results furnished by Mr. Dan Natale, Assistant Principal, Parkway West Senior High School, Ballwin, Missouri 63011.
18	Greater Anchorage Borough Health Department, Drug Use as Reported by 15,634 Anchorage, Alaska Students in Grades Six Through Twelve--1971. Mimeo, 33 p., Greater Anchorage Borough Health Department, Anchorage, Alaska, 1971.

Item No.	Reference
19	Hays, J. Ray, "The Incidence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston". St. Joseph Hospital Medical Surgical Journal, Vol. 6, Nos. 1&2, pp. 52-59, Spring 1971.
19	Hays, J. Ray, "The Incidence of Drug Abuse Among Secondary School Students in Houston, 1971". St. Joseph Hospital Medical Surgical Journal, Vol. 7, pp. 146-152, 1972.
20	Milne, L. D. and Vincent, Murray L., Survey of Drug Use Among South Carolina High School Students, Fall 1971. Mimeo, 33 p., Report of a Survey Funded by South Carolina Commission of Narcotics and Controlled Substances, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.
21	Council on Drug Abuse Control, Regional Drug Attitude and Abuse Pattern Survey Summary Report. Council on Drug Abuse Control, Richmond Regional Planning District Commission, Suite 810, 7th and Franklin Building, 701 E. Franklin Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219, no date.
22	Stroman, Duane S., High School Drug Use Survey in South Central Pennsylvania. Final Report on Project Subgrant No. CT-P-069 for Governor's Justice Commission (Pennsylvania), Region IV, by Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania 16652, February 29, 1972.
23	LaCroix, Kenneth J., Drug Abuse: A Survey of the Problem in the Stillwater Public Secondary School District 834, Stillwater, Minnesota. Mimeo, 42 p., prepared by the Family Drug Education Committee of District 834 with financial assistance from the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare Drug Abuse Pilot School District Program, June, 1971.
24	Hawaii, State of, Health Education Survey. Printed by the Office of Library Services, Teacher Assist Center, Publication No. TAC 72-4017, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, September 1, 1971.
25	Roth, Rodney, "Student Drug Abuse in Southeastern Michigan and Profiles of the Abusers." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 55-66, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

Item No.	Reference
26	Digital Resources Corporation, A Model for Criminal Justice System Planning and Control, Volume III: School Surveys. Final Report prepared for Tri-County Council on Criminal Justice, Southern California Association of Governments, by Digital Resources Corporation, 444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 808, Long Beach, California 90802, July 12, 1971.
27	Braucht, G. Nicholas and Berry, K. L., A Survey of Drug Using Behavior in Jefferson County, Colorado, Public Schools. Mimeo, 69 p., prepared by Social Science Systems, Inc., for Jefferson County School District No. 1, Donald E. Shaw, Coordinator of Drug Education, April 1971.
28	Elinson, Jack, A Study of Teen-Age Drug Behavior. Summary Progress Report covering the period 9/1/71 through 6/30/72 prepared by College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University for the National Institute of Mental Health under Grant Number MH-17589-03, June 1972.
29	Rainwater, Homer T. and Malone, Howard, Statewide Narcotics Use Survey of High School and Junior College Students. Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, Perkinston, Mississippi, 1971.
30	Wilson, Robert A. and Smith, Brenda B., Drug Use in the Wilmington School System: A Study of Drug Use Among Junior and Senior High School Students. Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, May 1972.
31	Rollins, Joan H. and Holden, Raymond H., "Adolescent Drug Use and the Alienation Syndrome." Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 249-261, September 1972.
32	Carter, James H. and Gregory, Robert J., "Assessment of the Prevalence of Drug Abuse Among Junior and Senior High School Students of Wake Coun', North Carolina." N. C. Journal of Mental Health, Vol. 5, No. , pp. 21-35, Summer 1971.
33	Phoenix Gaz te, "Teens Believe Drug Problem Grows." Tip-Off II, Teens in Ph nix--Opinions, Facts, Fancies, Student Survey reprinted fro Teen Gazette, The Phoenix Gazette, P. O. Box 1950, Phoenix, Ar zona 85001, 1969, 1971 pp. 13-15.
34	Wechsler, Henry and Thum, Denise, Drug Usage Among School-Age Youth in the Town of _____. Mimeo., 20 p., The Medical Foundation, Inc., 29 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116, October 21, 1971.

Item No.	Reference
35	Wechsler, Henry and Thum, Denise, The Extent of Drug Use in the _____Public Schools. Mimeo., 15 p., The Medical Foundation, Inc., 29 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116, September 24, 1971.
36	Schaps, Eric; Sanders, Clinton; and Hughes, Patrick, District 214 Drug Abuse Survey: An Interim Report. Epidemiology Unit, Illinois Drug Abuse Program, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, June 1971.
37	Wilson, Robert A., Drug Use in Delaware: A Study of Junior and Senior High School Students. Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, December 1971.
38	Londergan, Susan; Wilson, Robert A.; and McGrath, John H., "Patterns of Drug Use Among Adolescents in a Rural Community and in a Suburban Community". 41p.; Paper presented at 1971 Rural Sociological Society Meeting, Denver, Colorado (ED 052-882).
39	Gelineau, Victor A.; Zaks, Linda A.; Novick, Karen M; and Camp, Joy M., Report of the Youth Study to the Woburn Community. Mimeo, 12 p., Division of Drug Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health, Boston, Mass., April 9, 1971.
40	Babst, Dean V. and Brill, Leon, Drug Abuse Patterns Among Students in an Upstate New York Urban Area. Mimeo, 21 p., New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, New York City, February 1972.
41	Haberman, Paul W.; Josephson, Eric; Zanes, Anne; and Elinson, Jack, "High School Drug Behavior: A Methodological Report on Pilot Studies." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 103-121, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.
42	Larimer, George S.; Tucker, Alvin H., and Brown, Ellen F., "Drugs and Youth." Pennsylvania's Health, Vol. 31, No. 4, Winter Issue - 1970 and Vol. 32, No. 4, Winter Issue - 1971 (Reprinted by Division of Public Health Education, Pennsylvania Department of Health, 1971).

Item No.	Reference
43	Preston, James D. and Fry, Patricia A., "Marijuana Use Among Houston High School Students." Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 52, pp. 170-178, 1971.
44	Hager, David L.; Vener, Arthur M.; and Stewart, Cyrus S., "Patterns of Adolescent Drug Use in Middle America". Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 292-297, 1971.
45	Gossett, John T.; Lewis, Jerry M.; and Phillips, Virginia Austin, "Extent and Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use as Reported by 56,745 Students." The Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 216, No. 9, pp. 1464-1470, May 31, 1971.
46	Clarke, James W. and Levine, E. Lester, "Marijuana Use, Social Discontent and Political Alienation: A Study of High School Youth." The American Political Science Review, Vol. LXV, No. 1, pp. 120-130, March 1971.
47	Tec, Nechama, "Drugs Among Suburban Teenagers: Basic Findings." Soc. Sci. & Med., Vol. 5, pp. 77-84, 1971.
48	Wolfson, Edward A.; Lavenhar, Marvin A.; Blum, Richard; Quinones, Mark A.; Einstein, Stanley; and Louria, Donald B., "Survey of Drug Abuse in Six New Jersey High Schools: I-Methodology and General Findings." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 9-32, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.
49	Leahy, Patrick J.; Steffenhagen, Ronald A,; and Levine, Bruce L., "A Study of Drug Use Patterns of High School Students in the State of Vermont." Drug Dependence and Abuse Resource Book, Chicago, National District Attorneys Association, 1971, pp. 275-280.
50	Johnson, Kit G.; Donnelly, John H.; Scheble, Robert; Wine, Richard L.; and Weitman, Morris, "Survey of Adolescent Drug Use I — Sex and Grade Distribution". American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 61, No. 12, pp. 2418-2432, December 1971.
51	Jackson, Basil; Lange, Robert W.; and Lehman, Robert P., "Teenage Drug Abuse in Middle Class Milwaukee". Wisconsin Medical Journal, Vol. 71, pp. 210-212, September 1972.
52	Hays, J. Ray and Winburn, Michael G., "Drug Abuse Among Elementary School Students in a Suburban School Setting". Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 355-360, Winter 1972.

Item No.	Reference
53	Gelineau, Victor A.; Pearsall, Doris T.; Camp, Joy M.; and Zaks, Linda A., Report of the Natick Youth Study: A Profile of Students Grades Nine Through Twelve. Mimeo, 12 p., Division of Drug Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, April 1972.
54	Matchett, William Foster, "Who Use Drugs? A Study in a Suburban Public High School". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, No. 2, pp. 90-93, February 1971.
55	Globetti, Gerald and Brigance, Roy S., "The Use and Nonuse of Drugs Among High School Students in a Small Rural Community." Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 317-322, December 1971.
56	Goode, Erich, "Trends in College Drug Use: Report From One Campus." Proceedings of the First International Conference on Student Drug Surveys, Newark, New Jersey, September 12-15, 1971, pp. 123-127, published, 1972 by Baywood Publishing Company, 43 Central Drive, Farmingdale, New York 11735.
57	Slaby, Andrew E.; Lieb, Julian; and Schwartz, Arthur H., "Comparative Study of the Psychosocial Correlates of Drug Use Among Medical and Law Students." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 47, No. 9, pp. 717-723, September 1972.
58	Toohey, Jack V., "An Analysis of Drug Use Behavior at Five American Universities". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, No. 9, pp. 464-468, November 1971.
59	Lipp, Martin R.; Benson, Samuel G., and Taintor, Zebulon, "Marijuana Use by Medical Students". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 128, No. 2, pp. 207-12, August 1971.
59	Lipp, Martin; Tinklenberg, Jared; Benson, Samuel; Melges, Frederick; Taintor, Zebulon ; and Peterson, Margaret, "Medical Student Use of Marijuana, Alcohol, and Cigarettes: A Study of Four Schools". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 141-152, 1972.
60	Dvorak, Edward J., "A Longitudinal Study of Nonmedical Drug Use Among University Students--A Brief Summary". Journal of the American College Health Association, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 212-215, February 1972.

Item No.	Reference
61	Boardman, William K., "Comparison of Drug Attitudes of College Freshmen: Metropolitan Area Vs. University Community Setting". 10 p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern Psychological Association Convention, San Antonio, Texas, April 29 - May 1, 1971. (ED 051 535).
62	Garfield, Emily F.; Boreing, Michael L.; and Smith, Jean Paul, "Marijuana Use on a Campus: Spring, 1969". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 487-491, September 1971.
63	Ford, Beryl I., "Illegal Drug Use in a Student Population." The Medical Journal of Australia, pp. 309-313, August 7, 1971.
64	McCain, Minta J.; Grupp, Stanley, E.; and Schmitt, Raymond, L., "Marijuana Use in a Small College: A Midwest Example". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 463-485, September 1971.
65	Anker, Jeffrey L.; Milman, Doris H.; Kahan, Stuart A.; and Valenti, Carlo, "Drug Usage and Related Patterns of Behavior in University Students: I. General Survey and Marihuana Use." Journal of the American College Health Association, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 178-186, February 1971.
66	Barber, Josephine M. and Means, Richard K., "Amphetamine Use Among College Women". The Journal of School Health, Vol. XLI, No. 4, pp. 205-208, April 1971.
67	Barter, James T.; Mizner, George L.; and Werme, Paul H., Patterns of Drug Use Among College Students in the Denver-Boulder Metropolitan Area. An Epidemiological and Demographic Survey of Student Attitudes and Practices. SCID-TR-1, Final Report BNDD Contract No. J-68-51, Drug Control Division, Office of Scientific Support, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. 20537, September, 1971 (PB-205 002).
68	Bailey, Walter C., and Koval, Mary, "Differential Patterns of Drug Abuse among White Activists and Nonwhite Militant College Students". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 191-199, 1972.
69	Linn, Lawrence S., "Social Identification and the Use of Marijuana". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 79-107, March 1971.

Item No.	Reference
70	Greenwald, B. S. and Luetgert, M. J., "A Comparison of Drug Users and Non-Users on an Urban Commuter College Campus". The International Journal of the Addictions, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 63-78, March 1971.
71	Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Graduate and Professional Students". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 129, No. 4, pp. 415-420, October 1972.
71	Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Marijuana and Other Drug Use by Women College Students: Associated Risk-Taking and Coping Activities". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 130, No. 4, pp. 486-490, April 1973.
71	Rouse, Beatrice A. and Ewing, John A., "Student Drug Use, Risk-Taking and Alienation". Mimeo, 12 p., presented at the American Psychiatric Association 1973 Annual Meeting, May 7-11, Honolulu, Hawaii. Journal of the American College Health Assoc., 1974 (in press).
72	Cross, Herbert J. and Davis, Gary L., "College Students' Adjustment and Frequency of Marijuana Use". Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 65-67, 1972.
73	Solursh, Lionel P.; Weinstock, S. Joseph; Saunders, C. Scott; and Ungerleider, J. Thomas, "Attitudes of Medical Students Toward Cannabis". Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 217, No. 10, pp. 1371-1372, September 6, 1971.
74	Chambers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; Siegal, Harvey A.; and Conway, William S., An Assessment of the Incidence and Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Use Within the General Population of the State of South Carolina. Resource Planning Corporation, Washington, D. C., Miami, Florida, and White Plains, New York, August 1973
75	Chambers, Carl D.; Inciardi, James A.; and Siegal, Harvey A., An Assessment of the Incidence and Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Use Within the General Population of the State of Minnesota. Resource Planning Corporation, Washington, D. C. and Miami, Florida, April 1973.

Item No.	Reference
76	Schaps, Eric and Rubin, Elliot L., A Study of Prevalence and Intensity of Drug and Alcohol Use in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, August 10, 1973.
77	Hart, H. C., "Drug/Alcohol Survey. I: Usage Among a Group of Federal Employees". Nwsltr. Res. Psychol., Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 42-48, 1972.
78	Hart H. C. and Blitch, J. W., "Drug/Alcohol Survey. II: Usage Among a Group of VA Patients". Nwsltr. Res. Psychol., Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 2-5, 1972.
79	Wake Forest University, Youth Services Bureau, A Study of the Knowledge and Attitudes of Winston-Salem Citizens Concerning Drug Use and Abuse. Mimeo, 46 p., Youth Services Bureau of Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, March 1972.
80	Tennant, Forrest S., Jr. (Maj., MC, USAR), "Drug Abuse the U. S. Army, Europe". Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 221, No. 10, pp. 1146-1149, September 4, 1972.
81	Fisher, Allan H., Jr., Preliminary Findings from the 1971 DoD Survey of Drug Use. HumRRO Technical Report 72-8, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, March 1972.
82	Pilnick, Saul and Streit, Fred, A Survey of Drug Usage and Abuse in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Prepared by Scientific Resources Inc., Human Systems Institute, 41 Skyline Drive, Morristown, New Jersey 07960 for Montgomery County Drug Commission, Norristown, Pennsylvania, August 1971 (In Drug Abuse Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, November 1971; ED-066 674)
83	Nelson, K. Eric and Panzarella, Jacob, "Preliminary Findings--Prevalence of Drug Use, Enlisted Vietnam Returnees Processing for ETS Separation, Oakland Overseas Processing Center, March 1971." Mimeo. 8 p.

Item No.	Reference
84	New England Learning and Research, Inc., A Survey of Drug Use in a Cross-Section of Maine Communities. Prepared for the Interagency Commission on Drug Abuse by New England Learning and Research, Inc., 85 Cony Street, Augusta, Maine 04330, March 1971.
85	Baker, Stewart L., Jr. (Col., MC) "Present Status of the Drug Abuse Counteroffensive in the Armed Forces". Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, Vol. 48, No. 5, pp. 719-732, June 1972.
86	Chambers, Carl D. and Inciardi, James A., An Assessment of Drug Use in the General Population. New York: New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971
87	Chambers, Carl D., Differential Drug Use Within the New York State Labor Force. New York: New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971.
87	Chambers, Carl D. and Heckman, Richard D., "The Extent of Drug Abuse in Business and Industry". On pp. 115-159 in Employee Drug Abuse: A Manager's Guide for Action. Boston, Massachusetts: Cahners Books, 1972.
88	Greden, John F. and Morgan, Donald W., "Patterns of Drug Use and Attitudes Toward Treatment in a Military Population". Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 113-117, February 1972.
89	Lipp, Martin R.; Benson, Samuel G.; and Allen, Patricia S., "Marijuana Use by Nurses and Nursing Students". American Journal of Nursing, Vol. 71, No. 12, pp. 2339-2341, December 1971.
90	Edmundson, Walter F.; Davies, John E.; Acker, James D.; and Myer, Bernard, "Patterns of Drug Abuse Epidemiology in Prisoners". Industrial Medicine, Vol. 41, pp. 15-19, January 1972.
91	Stanton, Morris Duncan, "Drug Use in Vietnam: A Survey Among Army Personnel in the two Northern Corps". Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 26, pp. 279-286, March 1972.
92	Colbach, Edward, "Marijuana Use by GIs in Viet Nam". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 128, No. 2, pp. 204-207, August 1971.

Item No.	Reference
93	Baker, Stewart L., Jr. (Col., MC), "Drug Abuse in the United States Army". Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 541-549, June 1971.
94	Cisin, Ira H. and Manheimer, Dean I., "Marijuana Use Among Adults in a Large City and Suburb". Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 191, pp. 222-234, December 31, 1971.
95	Lipscomb, Wendell R., "Drug Use in a Black Ghetto". American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 127, No. 9, pp. 1166-1169, March 1971.
96	Bucky, Steven F., The Relationship Between Past Background and Drug Use. NAMRL-1135, Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute, Naval Aerospace Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida 32512, June 28, 1971 (AD-735 102).
97	Minkowski, William L.; Weiss, Robert C.; and Heidbreder, G. A., "A View of the Drug Problem -- A Rational Approach to Youthful Drug Use and Abuse". Clinical Pediatrics, Vol. 11, No. 7, pp. 376-381, July 1972.
98	Coddington, R. Dean and Jacobsen, Robert, "Drug Use by Ohio Adolescents—An Epidemiologic Study." The Ohio State Medical Journal, pp. 481-484, May 1972.

APPENDIX F

AUTHOR INDEX

	Item No.
Abelson, Herbert	3
Acker, James D.	90
Alaska (See Greater Anchorage)	18
Allen, Patricia S.	89
Anker, Jeffrey L.	65
Babst, Dean V.	40
Bailey, Walter C.	68
Baker, Stewart L., Jr.	85, 93
Barber, Josephine M.	66
Barter, James T.	67
Benson, Samuel G.	59, 89
Berry, K. L.	27
Blitch, J. W.	78
Blum, Richard	48
Boardman, William K.	61
Boreing, Michael L.	62
Braucht, G. Nicholas	27
Brigance, Roy S.	55
Brill, Leon	40
Brown, Ellen F.	42
Bucky, Steven F.	96
Camp, Joy M.	39, 53
Carter, James H.	32
Chambers, Carl D.	74, 75, 86, 87
Cisin, Ira H.	94
Clarke, James W.	46
Coddington, R. Dean	98
Cohen, Reuben	3
Colbach, Edward	92
Conway, William S.	74
Council on Drug Abuse Control	21
Cross, Herbert J.	72
Davies, John E.	90
Davis, Gary L.	72
Digital Resources Corp.	26
Donnelly, John H.	50
Duval County School Board	14
Dvorak, Edward J.	60
Edmundson, Walter F.	90
Einstein, Stanley	48
Elinson, Jack	5, 28, 41
Elseroad, Homer O.	13
Ewing, John A.	71
Fisher, Allan H., Jr.	81
Ford, Beryl I.	63
Fry, Patricia A.	43
Garfield, Emily F.	62
Gelineau, Victor A.	39, 53
Gergen, Kenneth J.	7
Gergen, Mary K.	7
Globetti, Gerald	55
Goode, Erich	56
Goodman, Samuel M.	13
Gossett, John T.	45
Grafstein, David	6
Greater Anchorage Borough Health Department	18
Greden, John F.	88
Greenwald, B. S.	70
Gregory, Robert J.	32
Grizzle, Gloria A.	12
Groves, W. Eugene	6
Grupp, Stanley E.	64
Haberman, Paul	5, 41
Hager, David L.	44
Harrison, James A.	15
Hart, H. C.	77, 78
Hawaii, State of	24
Hays, J. Ray	19, 52
Heckman, Richard D.	87
Heidbreder, G. A.	97
Holden, Raymond H.	31
Hughes, Patrick	36
Inciardi, James A.	74, 75, 86
Jackson, Basil	51
Jacobsen, Robert	98
Johnson, Kit G.	50
Johnston, Lloyd	8
Josephson, Eric	5, 41
Kahan, Stuart A.	65
Koval, Mary	68
LaCroix, Kenneth J.	23
Lange, Robert W.	51
Larimer, George S.	42

	Item No.
Lavenhar, Marvin A.	48
Leahy, Patrick J.	49
Lehman, Robert P.	51
Levine, Bruce L.	49
Levine, E. Lester	46
Lewis, Jerry M.	45
Lieb, Julian	57
Linn, Lawrence S.	69
Lipp, Martin R.	59, 89
Lipscomb, Wendell R.	95
Londergan, Susan	38
Louria, Donald B.	48
Luetgert, M. J.	70
Maida, Peter R.	10
Malone, Howard	29
Manheimer, Dean I.	94
Matchett, William Foster	54
McCain, Minta J.	64
McLeod, Jonnie H.	12
McGrath, John H.	38
Means, Richard K.	66
Melges, Frederick	59
Milman, Doris H.	65
Milne, L. D.	20
Minkowski, William L.	97
Mizner, George L.	67
Mobley, Jack	15
Morgan, Donald W.	88
Morse, Stanley J.	7
Myer, Bernard	90
Natale, Dan	17
Nelson, K. Eric	83
New England Learning and Research, Inc.	84
New Hampshire, State of	16
Novick, Karen M.	39
Panzarella, Jacob	83
Pearsall, Doris T.	53
Peterson, Margaret	59
Phillips, Virginia Austin	45
Phoenix Gazette	33
Pilnick, Saul	82
Playboy	4
Preston, James D.	43
Quinones, Mark A.	48
Rainwater, Homer T.	29
Response Analysis Corp.	1, 2
Rollins, Joan H.	31
Rossi, Peter H.	6
Roth, Rodney	25
Rouse, Beatrice A.	71
Rubin, Elliot L.	76
San Mateo County, Calif.	9
Sanders, Clinton	36
Saunders, C. Scott	73
Schaps, Eric	36, 76
Scheble, Robert	50
Schmitt, Raymond L.	64
Schrayer, Diane	3
Schwartz, Arthur H.	57
Siegal, Harvey A.	74, 75
Slaby, Andrew E.	57
Smith, Brenda B.	30
Smith, Jean Paul	62
Solursh, Lionel P.	73
Stanton, Morris Duncan	91
Steffenhagen, Ronald A.	49
Stewart, Cyrus S.	44
Streit, Fred	82
Stroman, Duane S.	22
Taintor, Zebulon	59
Tec, Nechama	47
Tennant, Forrest S., Jr.	80
Thum, Denise	34, 35
Tinklenberg, Jared	59
Toohey, Jack V.	58
Tucker, Alvin H.	42
Ungerleider, J. Thomas	73
Utah State Board of Education	11
Valenti, Carlo	65
Vener, Arthur M.	44

	Item No.
Vincent, Murray L.	20
Wake Forest University	79
Wechsler, Henry	34, 35
Weinstock, S. Joseph	73
Weiss, Robert C.	97
Weitman, Morris	50
Werme, Paul H.	67
Wilson, Robert A.	30, 37, 38
Winburn, Michael G.	52
Wine, Richard L.	50
Wolfson, Edward A.	48
Zaks, Linda A.	39, 53
Zanes, Anne	5, 41

APPENDIX G

INDEX OF REPORTS
CONTAINING STATISTICAL INFORMATION
ON
CHARACTERISTICS OTHER THAN EXTENT OF DRUG ABUSE

Characteristic	Item Nos.
Academic success, adjustment, or aspirations	7,8,25,27,28,30,31,32,36,49, 67,82
Age at which drug use started	22,24,27,40,63,84
Alcohol use	1,2,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,12,13,14, 15,16,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26, 27,28,29,30,31,33,34,35,36,38, 42,45,48,50,51,52,58,59,60,61, 71,74,75,76,77,78,79,82,84,89, 90,97,98
Attitudes toward drug use	3,6,8,10,11,21,22,28,32,79,82,86
Attitudes toward parents	10,12,14,22,32,40,42,61,70,82,96
Attitudes toward school	12,13,14,28,82
Availability of drugs, knowledge of	6,12,23,30,38,40,51,82,84
Career indecision	62
Communication media, influence of	13
Delinquent acts, involvement in	30,38
Demographic characteristics of regular drug users	86,87,88
Drug education, opinions on	12,14,20,22,27,36
Drug information, knowledge of	11,12,13,22,24,27,30,36,40,42, 52,71,79,86
Drug information, preferred sources of	6,13,14,23,28,30,36,37,38,40,71
Extra-curricular activities, participation in	8,25,30,36,38
Health, physical	12,73
Health, mental	12,71,72,73
Legal aspects, knowledge of	3,30,52,79,82,86
Legal aspects, opinions on	3,6,13,28,33,36,38,40,49,57,58, 59,63,67
Living arrangements	10,12,25,31,43,65,70,82
Marital relationships	65
Parents' educational level	12,28,46,49,67,70,82,84
Parents' income/occupational status	12,22,28,31,36,38,46,67,70,82
Parents' use of alcohol, drugs, or tobacco	36,43,51,52
Peer groups relationships or influence	12,13,14,22,25,28,30,32,33,36, 38,69,82
Perceptions of the drug scene	13
Reasons for first taking drugs	10,20,30,40,67

Characteristic	Item Nos.
Reasons for using drugs	6,20,27,48,51,60,61,67,71,79
Reasons for not using drugs	20,24,28,30,37,40,48,60,67,71
Religious activities, participation in	12,25,28,30,33,57,60,70,71,82
Self-esteem	14,25
Settings in which drugs are used	13,23,40
Tobacco use	5,6,8,9,10,13,14,15,16,17,18, 19,23,24,25,26,27,28,30,33,38, 42,45,48,50,51,52,59,60,61,77, 78,84,89

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND
MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
5600 FISHERS LANE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20852

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF H.E.W.
HEW 389

NOTICE OF MAILING CHANGE

☐ Check here if you wish to discontinue receiving this type of publication.

☐ Check here if your address has changed and you wish to continue receiving this type of publication. (Be sure to furnish your complete address including zip code.)

Tear off cover with address label still affixed and send to:

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration
Printing and Publications Management Section
5600 Fishers Lane (Rm. 6-105)
Rockville, Maryland 20852

DHEW Publication No. (ADM) 75-139
Printed 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION